1-1-1997

Peer group talk in a language arts classroom : an ethnographic study of Hawaiian adolescents.

Theresa A. Gnatek
University of Massachusetts Amherst

PEER GROUP TALK IN A LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSROOM: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF HAWAIIAN ADOLESCENTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

THERESA A. GNATEK

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1997

School of Education

PEER GROUP TALK IN A LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSROOM: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF HAWAIIAN ADOLESCENTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

THERESA A. GNATEK

Approved as to style and content by:

Judith Solsken, Chair

David Bloome, Member

Donal Carbaugh, Member

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my friend,

Lynn Vogt,

the embodiment of aloha

and

educators everywhere who strive

to learn from their students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many people. Special gratitude is conveyed to my committee members. I thank my Committee Chairperson, Dr. Judith Solsken, for her guidance and direction; Dr. David Bloome for his theoretical insights; and Dr. Donal Carbaugh for his methodological suggestions and analytic framework.

Much appreciation and thanks goes to school officials, teachers, parents, support staff, and students at the school where the research was conducted. Without their cooperation and assistance the study would not have been possible. Please know your many kindnesses were greatly appreciated.

I thank Kathryn Au, Wanda Porter, Margaret Phinney, Jane Nagle, Jane Carnes, and Peter Elbow for their various forms of support. I am especially grateful for my treasured friends whose sustenance knew no bounds. *Mahalo nui loa* Marilyn Pike, Maureen Costello, Linda Bacon, and especially Gail Lucey. I thank my sister, Jeanette, for her continual positive energy and belief in my goals. Most importantly, I thank my husband, Eddie, for his patience, encouragement, assistance, and pride in my efforts.

Words cannot express the immeasurable gratitude I extend to everyone who lived with me, in body or spirit, through this rite of passage.

ABSTRACT

PEER GROUP TALK IN A LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSROOM:
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF HAWAIIAN ADOLESCENTS

MAY 1997

THERESA A. GNATEK, B.A., NORTH ADAMS STATE COLLEGE

M.ED., WESTFIELD STATE COLLEGE

ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Judith Solsken

This dissertation reports an ethnographic investigation of the peer group talk of Hawaiian middle school students during an English language arts class. It is concerned with the academic and social agendas of the seventh grade participants. The purpose of the research was to investigate: a) student labels and descriptions of their interactive accomplishments; b) communicative features which characterized academic and social engagement; c) relationships and identities invoked in the conversations. The study was conducted over one school year with primary focus on one group of four students.

The analytic categories "doing English" and "socializing" were derived from field notes, video tapes, group and individual interviews, and copies of pertinent written documents. These student terms-for-talk foregrounded their perceptions of what was required to participate appropriately in the language arts classroom and recognition

of "socializing" as an acceptable, prominent, and purposeful activity within the small peer group and larger classroom context.

Instances-of-the-terms-for-talk were interrogated to identify topic patterns, features-of-the-talk, norms of interaction, and tone of engagement. Patterns of engagement related to peer group harmony included "getting busted," arguing and fighting, preserving the status of group members, using humor, and mediating tensions.

Intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics were examined as dimensions of individual autonomy and group affiliation. Enactments of personhood or identity invoked in the terms for talk "doing English" and "socializing" were rendered as those of 'student' and 'friend' respectively. Monitoring, assessing, directing, clarifying, and confirming were salient interactional strategies associated with academic endeavors, while using humor emerged as the prominent feature of social interactions.

The significance of this investigation relates to the value of socializing. Off-task conversations served to promote collective group identity, mediate tensions that arose during academic engagement, and further develop the social and personal identities of the participants. These insights contribute to the literature on face-to-face interactions in classrooms by legitimizing "socializing" or

off-task talk as an activity form that can serve to expedite on-task or academic interactions such as "doing English." The results of the study expand our understandings of how students categorize, describe, and construct classroom events.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND FOCUS OF THE STUDY

A. Overview and Background

This dissertation is an ethnographic study of peer group talk in a language arts classroom. Using microanalysis of videotaped events that occurred when the students were talking among themselves, interview data, writing samples, and field notes, I examined the face-to-face interactions of a group of Hawaiian students in a seventh grade classroom. My purpose was to better understand what was being accomplished through their conversations. Specifically, my foci were the student perceptions of their talk, salient features of social and academic engagement, and the roles, relationships and identities invoked by the participants.

Research on classroom talk has generally focused on student-teacher interactions. In the past three decades social constructivist theories have led to recommendations for peer group work. However, student-student conversations, which are the focus of this dissertation, include an area of classroom discourse where less research exists. Cazden elaborates the value of peer group interactions in this way:

> While such interactions take place at home and in the community as well as at school, they are especially important in school because of the limitations and rigidities characteristic of most teacher-student interactions in institutionalized settings...

> The contrast between such learning environments and the classroom is striking... The only context in which children can reverse interactional roles with the same intellectual content, giving directions as well as following them, and asking questions as well as answering them, is with their peers.
>
> But, someone may say, students talk all the time among themselves outside of school. Why use valuable school time for more of the same, when they could be talking with the (expert) teacher? My answer is that in out-of-school conversations the talk is not about school subjects, and does not provide an opportunity for students to practice forms of academic discourse -- the special ways of talking in school.
>
> ...It also makes no sense to have learning so individualized in school when teams and committees are such a prominent part of adult life (1988, pp. 134-135).

Thus, peer group conversations offer a unique context for classroom research. Interactions not directly influenced by the teacher enable students to negotiate with each other regarding academic and social issues, as well as roles, relationships and responsibilities. Ideally engagement is twofold, with learners participating in a variety of communicative exchanges and being provided with opportunities to reflect on the new understandings acquired (Beach & Hynds, 1990).

Previous studies of peer group talk have addressed how small group interactions change the nature of learning (Barnes & Todd, 1977, 1994); the use of language for communicating in the classroom (Wilkinson, 1982); the significance of group discussions in developing practical communication skills (Pinnell, 1984); promoting student thinking and understanding through small group discussion (Wells & Nicholls, 1985; Phillips, 1985); the value of dialogue in the learning process (Edwards & Westgate, 1987); reader responses to text (Golden, 1987); literature discussion groups (Gilles, 1991,1993); developing a curriculum of talk (Cone, 1993); student engagement in the writing process (Stock & Robinson, 1989; Phinney, 1992; Ludlam, 1992); how oral texts shape and relate to written texts (Floriani, 1994); and the nature of collaborative learning (Bruffee, 1993). Each of these studies provided positive evidence regarding the value of student-student interactions in the classroom and recognized the socio-academic dimensions of schooling. However, academic outcomes were primarily addressed. Examination of the interplay between academic and social agendas from the perspective of the participants has been called for in order to construct theories of schooling which represent both the interests of students and educators (Phinney, 1992). This study investigates topics, dimensions, and functions of off-task or social talk in relation to on-task or academic conversations. The salience of socializing, explored from the perspective of

the adolescent student participants, provides insights into peer group talk not previously addressed in the literature.

B. Theoretical Framework for the Study

Sociolinguistic and anthropological theory were utilized in this investigation of student conversations and relationships within the local social system. Educational research within a sociolinguistic perspective addresses the role of language in schooling (Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1992), the influences of socio-interactional factors, and what must be understood to participate in meaningful interactions (Green, 1992). An anthropological or ethnography of communication perspective examines how patterns of behavior reveal the ways that shared meanings are continually negotiated through social interaction (Jacob & Jordon, 1993), linguistic variety within a speech community, and how messages are interpreted as appropriate or effective (Green, 1992).

Hymes' (1974) model for ethnographies of communication provided the conceptual framework for this investigation of peer group talk. The goal was to better understand how language was used to serve referential and social functions situated in the classroom context; how language was an organized, communicative, and cultural process; and how language was multidisciplinary (Hymes, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1981; Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1992). The "Terms for Talk" analytic framework of Carbaugh (1989) was implemented to investigate the communicative labels and descriptions

identified as salient by the student participants. The sociolinguistic mappinging system of Green and Wallat (1981) was adapted to systematically analyze the transcripts selected for microanalysis. The dissertation entails the close study of the interactions of one peer group of Hawaiian students in their seventh grade language arts class:

> An investigation of face-to-face peer group interactions requires methods of data collection that maintain the sequential structure of indigenous interactive events and makes visible the process that these events are both embedded within and constitute... and a mode of analysis that focuses on how competent members use talk socially to act out the ordinary scenes of their everyday life (Goodwin, 1990, p. 286).

C. Focus of the Study

The study was guided by three interrelated research questions which evolved during the iterative analysis and data collection processes of the ethnographic design. A review of the previous research on peer group talk in educational settings also functioned to narrow my general focus -- what was being accomplished in these face-to-face interactions -- to the following areas of study and corresponding research questions.

The first area of study was the student perceptions of their talk:

How did the students label and describe
their interactive accomplishments?

Careful attention was paid to the labels used by the student participants to identify and differentiate their activity involvement which allowed for analytic movement between localized instances of talk and cultural claims. Once instances of the phenomena were identified, detailed transcriptions, interview data, and conversational analysis were implemented to record empirical evidence of instances of the terms-for-talk and descriptions of the events or talk-about-talk (Carbaugh, 1989).

The second area of study involved further analysis of the student labels and descriptions (described in question #1) from my perspective as the researcher:

What communicative features characterized
academic and social engagement?

At this level of analysis the data providing instances of terms-for-talk were interrogated with an eye toward identifying features-of-the-talk, claims regarding values and beliefs, forms and functions of the conversations within the seventh grade language arts classroom.

The third area of study involved interpersonal dynamics of the peer group members from the combined perspectives of the participants and researcher:

What relationships and identities were
enacted in the peer group talk?

"There is an assumption that beyond observable aspects of talk are communal understandings of personhood, relationships, power, and talk itself that inform individuals' interpretations of the discourse" (Fitch, 1994, p. 54). The students' perspective was key in providing the foundation for further examination of relationships and identities reflected in and constitutive of the peer group talk but not readily identifiable to a non-participant. Examination of interpersonal and intrapersonal issues led to further understanding of what the students in this peer group had the opportunity to experience and learn.

D. Significance of the Study

Talk has always been a primary medium in classroom instruction, but has traditionally been the teacher's means of transmitting knowledge to students. However, in recent decades, Vygotsky (1962), Bakhtin (Todorov, 1984), Bruner (1987), Wertsch (1985), and others have elevated the status of student talk in classrooms where spoken language functions to enhance communication and learning. Although the significance of peer group talk in classrooms has been substantiated, many questions still exist regarding the nature and value of these interactions. Several sociolinguistic studies have addressed this general concern, however, there is a dearth of research on peer group talk which recognizes the participants as observers and analysts of their own interactions. Student categorizations of their activities and characterizations of engagement provide a way

to connect the perspectives of classroom members with those of the researcher (Baker, 1994). As such, the findings of this dissertation contribute analytic insights to the understanding of peer group talk in the classroom. Pedagogical implications of the study relate to the utility, nature, structure, and history regarding peer groups in the classroom. Each of these factors influence the dynamic social and academic possibilities experienced within a peer group context and expand definitions of what counts as learning in school.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

In this chapter I review literature that provided theoretical, methodological, and cultural connections to my research. The first section chronicles conceptual scholarship which examined interactional patterns in educational contexts. Classroom interactions, peer group learning, and social perspectives of learning are addressed. This body of literature represents theoretical premises of the dissertation. In the second section, the utility of the "terms for talk" framework in the study of peer group talk is discussed. The analytic methodology connects student characterizations of their interactions with researcher descriptions. The third section summarizes Hawaiian cultural patterns that enhanced my understanding of the conversational norms of the peer group I studied.

B. Research on Classroom Discourse

The progression of the literature reviewed in this section illustrates the evolution of educational theory, practice, and research methodologies related to language arts instruction over the past three decades. This scholarship provided the conceptual background for my study of peer group talk in a seventh grade English class.

One factor that has influenced educational trends is research on the ways that students and teachers coordinate and construct educational environments. It has been found

that the organization of classroom interactions can serve to enhance or impede learning opportunities (see Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Bossert, 1979; Gilmore & Glatthorn, 1982; Wilkinson, 1982; Stubbs & Hillier, 1983; Delamont, 1984).

1. Classroom Interactional Patterns

Students in American classrooms have traditionally been viewed as more individual than social. This emphasis on individuality rather than group membership has been defined as a prominent feature of classroom discourse (Cazden, 1988).

Susan Philips (1972), in her pioneering study found the ways classroom interactions were conducted to be problematic for Warm Springs Indian children. When comparing the conversational patterns of Warm Springs children and Anglo children, Philips found the conventional classroom structure was at some times unfamiliar and uncomfortable to the Indian children. The classroom demands for individuality and competition among peers ran counter to the community participation structures in which sociality and cooperation were valued. Additionally, on the reservation the children learned through observation, practiced their abilities in private, and then participated in supervised practice. Therefore, at school these children did not spontaneously engage in recitation in the whole class context. When engaged in small group student-directed activities students actively participated because of their familiarity with this type of interactional structure (Philips, 1972). Scollon and Scollon (1980) described a similar pattern in their study of

Athabascan children. In rural Western Samoa, Sutter (1980) found one-to-one student/teacher interactions and emphasis on individualism in school to conflict with the group socialization and egalitarianism of the Samoan culture.

One of the classic longitudinal studies of the organization of language use was conducted by Heath (1983). In her study of the Piedmont Carolinas, students in the fifth grade science class functioned as ethnographers: conducted interviews with local residents, transcribed the data, and decided on follow-up questions. Essentially, the students analyzed, interpreted, and applied a scientific system to their familiar folk system, and decontextualized and reconstructed their folk knowledge into scientific categories valued in school. In this reciprocal process, community and educational knowledge merged as students "translated the knowledge familiar in one domain into another" (p. 321).

The critical ethnography of Everhart (1983) was based on two years of fieldwork in a junior high school where the lives of four adolescent boys were studied. Everhart explored how the educational system de-emphasized student responsibilities and fostered passive compliance; whereas home interactions promoted independence. In Reading, Writing, and Resistance, humor, joking, and goofing off were cultural forms of communication which gave the students some degree of power over the formal school curriculum, their peer relationships, and roles. Everhart, like Heath, believed that historically entrenched traditional teaching methods

problematized rather than recognized student knowledge. He raised issues regarding the curricular and institutional frameworks of junior high schools that depict students as lacking independence and responsibility. With the changing economic and family structure of our society, Everhart submitted, "The young, in many ways, have increased responsibilities, to treat adolescents as passive dependents in school while expecting active independence in many other walks of life makes little sense" (1983, p. 265).

Each of these studies challenged the decontextualized and asocial structure of traditional pedagogy. Changes in the classroom participation structures -- moves away from large class recitation models -- were advocated. Restructuring classrooms to include student partnerships and small group instructional opportunities was found to elicit more active student engagement. The substantiation of peer group settings as more conducive to learning denotes a basic underlying premise of this examination of face-to-face interactions. A micro ethnographic approach was utilized to more closely study the broad interactional and cultural patterns reported in these macro level ethnographic studies.

2. Peer Group Learning

Strong traditional ideologies of teaching as imparting knowledge, questioning, evaluating, directing, and orchestrating students' classroom activities have resulted in limited opportunities for student talk in many classrooms.

Over the last three decades there has been a spate of research on language and learning which supports a more interactive classroom context. Vygotsky (1962, 1978), who emphasized the social organization of instruction for the development of conscious awareness and control of knowledge (Moll,1990), has been most influential in the elevated status of talk in previously quiet classrooms (see Cazden, 1988; Gallimore & Tharp, 1988; Moll, 1990; Wertsch, 1985, 1991). From a Vygotskian perspective, a classroom environment most conducive to learning provides opportunities for conversations, between teachers and students as well as in peer groups, for the negotiation of meanings and sharing in the social construction of knowledge:

> Learning is first used for communication with others, but these social encounters with others produce the need to check and confirm thoughts. This process then provides the basis for new modes of internal mental functioning. In this way social experiences affect the course of individual development (Barnes & Todd, 1995, p. 137).

Theoretically, oral language has been described as a tool for learning. Therefore, instructional settings that provide students with opportunities to engage in conversations, putting language into use, are advocated (Edwards & Westgate, 1987). Practically, many questions still exist for teachers regarding their role as facilitators

of these student-student interactions. The research of Barnes and Todd on communication and learning in small groups contributed substantially to the understandings of practitioners when first reported in 1977, and has stood the test of time in the reformulated 1995 edition. Barnes and Todd summarize their perspective in this way:

> ...we are not claiming that all educational purposes can be carried out in small groups; that would be absurd. Our study has made it clear that younger adolescents can under helpful circumstances carry out collaborative learning in small groups, and that at times they display impressive cognitive and social abilities. Our point is that to place responsibility in students' hands changes the nature of their learning by requiring them to negotiate their own criteria of relevance and truth. If schooling is to develop in young people the qualities needed for responsible adult life, such learning has an important place in the repertoire of the social relationships teachers have at their disposal (1995, p. 166).

Terry Phillips (1985) explored the perspectives of Barnes and Todd, Wells, and Bruner when researching the role of a middle school language arts teacher; acknowledging the shift away from quiet, teacher-directed contexts to more interactive environments. He took issue with the beliefs of

some educators in the 1980's who assumed that simply allowing opportunities for talk in classrooms would meet the educational needs of students. Phillips contended that structured peer groups provide contexts in which linguistic opportunities can address the curriculum demands of the middle school more effectively than whole class instruction for two reasons. First, whole class discussions restrict access to negotiations for meaning. Secondly, there is not an authoritarian or more knowledgeable member controlling the discourse, as when the teacher is present. Phillips' premise was not that students don't have the ability to converse with adults in the same way as they do with peers, but that they choose not to because of preconceived notions that adults are more knowledgeable. Therefore, when conversing with the teacher, students were less likely to challenge, question, or make suggestions. Phillips proposed the need for careful analysis of peer group conversations in order to understand what actually takes place among the students.

The theory and research reported in this section aimed at making a case for the use of peer groups in the classroom to support the traditional cognitive goals of education. This information provided important background for my study of the social aspects of peer group learning.

3. Social Perspectives of Learning

The studies reviewed next reflect the movement in educational research toward social views of classroom interaction in general and peer groups in particular. Beach,

Green, Kamil and Shanahan describe the trend in this way, "Now that classroom instruction has shifted to focusing on the teacher as facilitator and the students as actively engaged in collaborative learning, researchers have focused their attention more on classroom interactions" (1992, p. 5). Three overlapping levels of classroom interaction include: the teacher-class level, teacher-student level, and student-student level (Bloome & Theodorou, 1988). Student-student or peer group research, the focus of this dissertation, will be the main focus of the following discussion on interactive sociolinguistics, language as social action, social and academic agendas.

a. Interactional Sociolinguistics

Gumperz has defined interactive sociolinguistics as the intertwining of two traditions of educational research, classroom ethnography and sociolinguistics.

> The interactional sociolinguistic approach focuses on the interplay of linguistic, contextual, and social presuppositions which interact to create the conditions of classroom learning. Analysis focuses on key instructional activities the ethnographic observations have shown may be crucial to the educational process. These activities are realized through definable speech events which stand out against the background of everyday conversation; they have

> characteristics which can be understood and can be described by ethnographers and recognized by participants (1986, p. 65).

Beneath these principles are the implicit assumptions that language is functional and that in order to use language one must have linguistic and communicative competence. Edwards and Westgate refer to Hymes in their description:

> Classrooms offer an exceptionally useful and appropriate setting for basic work in sociolinguistics generally; the essential activities which take place there throw into relief both fundamental processes of verbal interactivity, and the ways in which personal and cultural identities are realized in and through the resultant discourse (1987, p. 51).

Hymes' (1974) framework for ethnographies of communication offers a research methodology for better understanding how language is used to serve referential functions and social functions situated in context; how language is an organized, communicative, and cultural process; and how language is multidisciplinary. The primary purpose is to discover how oral language is systematically patterned in ways which are revealed in the interactional and situational relationships within the local social system. Ethnographic research of peer group talk is particularly significant in studying communicative competence in schools

because the one level of classroom interaction in which students assume reciprocal interactive roles with the same intellectual content, issuing directives and following directions, posing questions and answering those of others, is with their peers (Cazden, 1988).

Micro ethnography focuses on specifically bounded contexts or events to closely examine specified socialization and contextualization processes. This recent trend in educational research has been elaborated in the work of McDermott (1978), Wallat and Green (1981), Erickson (1981), Gumperz (1986), Dorval (1990), Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz (1992), Green (1992), Zaharlick and Green (1992), Beach et al (1992), Bloome and Bailey (1992), and others. Micro ethnography focuses on face-to-face interactions at the event level, and the ways that the moment-by-moment contextualization and linguistic processes unfold. The basic change in focus is from the search for universals to the particular:

> Rather than seeking universals there is an increasing emphasis on the particular: on what happens in a particular place, at a particular time, with a particular set of people, engaged in a particular activity and event. What becomes important about that particular place, time, people, activity and event, is what it means, what its significance is for the people involved and for others, and what its import is for other events (Bloome & Bailey, 1992, p. 182).

Bloome and Bailey (1992) define an event as an identifiable segment of face-to-face interaction with a recognizable beginning, end, and act sequence. As a unit of analysis it allows for the investigation of its social construction: the ways that participants, their concerted actions and language define, construct, and contextualize the event, emphasizing that meaning is situated in the event. Particularity encompasses the unique aspects of an event which make it different from other events when broader social, cultural, educational, or economic processes are considered.

Relevant educational studies that have utilized a micro ethnographic research framework have focused on one type of event such as "sharing time" (Michaels & Cook-Gumperz, 1979; Michaels, 1986) within the larger classroom context with varying groups of students. Other studies addressed peer group interactions as related to reading and writing processes (Bloome, 1989; Phinney, 1992; Ludlam, 1992). This study was aimed toward an increased understanding of what was being accomplished in the face-to-face interactions. Although literacy issues were explored, the interactional dynamics at work in the peer group conversations were the primary focus.

b. Language as Social Action

Margorie Goodwin (1978, 1990) has shown how it "is possible to analyze language as a functionally integrated component of a group's social organization and culture" in

her study of talk as social organization among black children. In selecting the context of her study Goodwin decided to steer away from a school setting that would be controlled by the teacher or institutional demands, believing the playground to be more conducive for unrestrained conversations. Cazden (1988) has described the peer group as the least constrained context of educational discourse and has further identified the importance of peer group talk in educational settings. Micro ethnographic methods allow for the investigation of face-to-face interactions in school from the perspective advocated by Goodwin (1978, 1990) in the study of social organization and culture.

The examination of peer group interactions furthers our "understanding of how everyday life in classrooms is constructed by members through their interactions, verbal and other, and how these constructions influence what students have opportunities to access, accomplish, and thus 'learn' in schools" (Green & Dixon, 1994, p. 231). Research on language in the classroom reveals interactional patterns; however, these patterns change moment-by-moment across time and classroom events (Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992b).

Educational settings have been described as contexts in which communicative competence, verbal interactivity, and cultural identities are displayed (Edwards & Westgate, 1987).

> For classroom members the daily movement through time, event to event, is part of the essential communicative knowledge of when an event is happening, how a shift in activity is taking place and is recognizable as such, how such a shift becomes a new context which tells what to expect next, and how to interpret what is said (Gumperz, 1986, p. 67).

In studying peer interactions one can describe the relevant cultural norms and values of the group in characteristic speech events. In analyzing these time-bounded sequences of interaction, concerted behavior (McDermott, Godspodinoff & Aron, 1978) and interactional construction of social contexts (Erickson & Schultz, 1977) can be explored. There are rules or norms governing access to speaking that are operating moment-by-moment in any particular event (Bloome & Bailey, 1992). The implicit cultural norms and patterns of face-to-face communication are created, continued, changed, and transmitted through socialization (Jacobs & Jordon, 1993). This socialization process is the focus of this dissertation.

c. Social and Academic Agendas

The study of the moment-by-moment evolution of peer group talk provides the opportunity to study the social and academic agendas of schooling (Green & Dixon, 1994; Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1994).

> To attend to what is learned, we need to understand activities from the learner's point of view. If as Moffet suggested (1983 [1969]), students' first agenda is social interaction, we must find out how that agenda affects and is affected by the tasks in which we ask children to engage (Phinney, 1992, p. 7).

One classroom context in which social relationships, cultural ideologies, and identities are constituted is face-to-face interaction (Willett, Solsken & Keenan, 1994). Structured peer groups provide settings which make language opportunities more available to students than whole class instruction (Phillips, 1985). Research that examines student perspectives of their social and academic agendas in the classroom has increased in recent years (Floriani, 1994; Cazden, 1988; Phinney, 1992; Ludlam, 1992). By studying talk as text in classroom settings we can begin to explore the ways that interactional patterns, communicative forms, identities of the participants, and educational contexts influence the nature and purposes of academic and social engagement.

Phinney (1992) outlined a "Dynamic Model of Peer Interaction and Individual Agency in Classrooms." The salience of her innovative model was the recognition of student agendas:

> ...students have their own social and academic agendas, both individually and collectively. These agendas influence the nature of students' engagement in school activities, including what they learn and how they learn it. If we are to value the significance of social influences of student interaction... we will need to attend to the nature of the interactions that the teacher cannot orchestrate by virtue of her inability to be omniscient, omnipotent, and ubiquitous. A clearer picture will emerge if the model takes into account the dynamics of the interaction itself, the nature and importance of the students' agendas, and the additional products that come out of the interaction (1992, p. 15).

Research on adolescent peer group interactions that is inherently responsive to Phinney's model has shown connections between writing or reading processes and social agendas. In his study of vocational high school students, Ludlam (1992) found that the students used the writing process to construct and renegotiate their social identities at school by way of raising their own status, raising the status of another group member, lowering another's status, lowering one's own status, or seeking group equality. Issues of community building and group member status were continually negotiated in and through the face-to-face interactions. Floriani (1994) also examined the relationship between written and oral texts in her study of a bilingual sixth grade classroom. Like Ludlam, Floriani found that the

"exploration of how social and academic processes and tasks were negotiated, constructed, and maintained led to an understanding of how roles and relationships and content and meaning are interactionally-constructed and situationally-defined dimensions of classroom life" (1994, p. 270). Similarly, this study is designed to investigate social issues within an adolescent peer group. However, the data analysis and findings pertain to oral texts rather than the relationship of oral to written texts.

Gilles (1991) examined seventh grade learning disabled students as they participated in literature study groups where their teachers also participated as group members. She found that the social context allowed the students to negotiate roles and discussion topics, as well as connect their personal lives to the books. Categories of student talk included: talk that recreated the book, talk about the author, talk that extended the reading process, talk that began and extended critical discussions, talk that enabled the group routine, and talk that was off the subject (1991, p. vi). Although both social and academic conversational agendas were identified, it was the academic outcomes that were the focus of Gilles' research. This study is designed to address the interplay between academic and social forms of interaction.

Another study that parallels my emphasis on the functions of classroom talk was conducted by Cone (1993), although she examined whole class interactions when

researching the pedagogy of talk in a ninth grade. Cone described the use of conversations to promote literacy learning and create a classroom community in this way, "We saw talk as having two roles in the classroom; a social role that helps create a warm, polite, and safe environment and an academic role that allows students to teach and learn from each other" (1993, p. 31). My micro ethnographic methodology will delineate specific social and academic topics and communicative features of the student talk.

In an inner-city junior high school, Shuman explored (1986) the multiple uses of oral and written text as issues of entitlement and status:

> The bulk of the conversations and stories described or discussed fights and fight accounts and have come to represent what I know about the adolescents' orientation toward their world. Fights are commonplace occurrences in the junior high school and are an important aspect of what every junior high student knows. They are fundamental to the adolescent worldview. Fight accounts document the everyday, normal adolescent world (1986, pp. 11-12).

Shuman identified two language categories to analyze the fight accounts of the junior high students. 'Differential knowledge' distinguished what most participants knew from what only some participants knew, and was continually appraised to determine who did the telling and who did the

listening. 'Shared knowledge' encompassed the communicative expectations regarding what stories were told and when they were told. Issues of status and entitlement were constantly considered and negotiated in the interplay between shared and differential knowledge. On that basis, Shuman described adolescence as a period of playing with writing and speaking, of transforming conventional uses of written and spoken texts for their own purposes. In her data, the greatest differences between speaking and writing were the contexts of use; although all of the adolescents had some story to tell about the fights in school, not all had a story to write. The 'circumstances of repeatability' distinguished the two modes of discourse; spoken texts were repeatable, whereas originality was required of written texts. Authorship of either was an issue of entitlement and status. Although broader in scope than my study, Shuman's research offers interesting insights into the nature of adolescent conversations in school.

In each of the studies discussed in this section, academic and social agendas were salient issues delineated from the perspective of the researchers:

> Norms of language use are the descriptive means of identifying or labeling the apparent rules governing the use of language in the peer group. The norms develop in the peer group as the members attend to their various agendas, both social and academic. The norms are a means of

> discussing the various modes or aspects of language use identified by the researcher: they should not be construed as overt rules created by the peer group (Ludlam, 1992, p. 10).

In this study the students differentiate and describe academic and social activity within their peer group interactions. Their labels and description add another perspective to our understanding of the complex interplay of academic and social activity in the classroom.

d. Issues of Identity

The research of classroom talk implies the study of identity because conversational tasks are cultural enactments of identity (Carbaugh, 1988). My data analysis addressed issues of identity to a limited degree which will also be reflected in the literature reviewed in this section. I examined the intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics of engagement using the dimensions of individual autonomy and group affiliation. (The identities of 'student' and 'friend' were also addressed and will be discussed in connection to the "terms for talk" framework in the next section.)

In every act or interaction participants are seemingly pulled in two directions, toward self and toward others. Identity is "a two-sided social function consisting of the need to be connected or involved with others and the need to be separate, distinct, or autonomous in comparison to others" (Phinney, 1992, p. 153). This identity dichotomy was

described as individuality or "separateness" which was compared to belonging or "connectedness" by Solsken (1993). Dyson (1989) differentiated "being special," "competent," and "distinctive," from the "desire to belong," "be with one's friends," and "be accepted by a group." Tannen (1986, 1990) used the term "independence" when referring to self and "intimacy" and "involvement" in connections to others. Carbaugh (1988) described "personhood" with features of "personalness, separateness, uniqueness" to represent "individual voice" and features of "connectedness, commonality, sociality" to represent "communal voice."

> The word identity is used to mean two almost opposite states of being. When we refer to someone maintaining their own identity, we are talking about separateness, autonomy, or individuality--a sense of uniqueness with the group and independence from the group, though always relative to the group. When we say someone identifies with someone else, we are talking about connectedness--a cojoining of one person's self-image with their perception of the image of another (Phinney, 1992, p. 44).

The concept of connectedness or group affiliation is implicit in collaborative learning or peer group contexts where some degree of consensus is required for task completion. Bruffee used the American Heritage Dictionary

definition of consensus to define collaborative learning as "a collective opinion, general agreement, or accord." Thus, what members of a knowledge or discourse community "know" is what the members of the group agree upon. Implicit in this notion are the varying degrees of dissent or disagreement which are addressed to reach consensus. Bruffee posited the following possibilities (1993, p. 221):

Loyal Opposition:	Disloyal Opposition:
grudging assent	passive resistance
willingness to go along	covert resistance
trade-offs	overt resistance
agreements to disagree	walkouts
recorded objections	sabotage

When studying the social construction of knowledge in peer group interactions in the classroom there is the potential for all these happening. More research is needed to better understand how group members function together and reach agreement (Bruffee, 1993). The dichotomy of individual autonomy and group affiliation used in this study provides one means of analyzing intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics within the student interactions.

C. Utility of the "Terms for Talk" Framework in the Study of Peer Group Talk

Studies of classroom interactions focus on communication systems within educational contexts. "Central to

understanding the constructed nature of life in classrooms is the idea that members of a group are constructing a referential system that enables those members to communicate more effectively" (Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992b, p. 30, c.f. Edwards & Mercer, 1987). Baker contends that description and analysis are features of classroom talk and interaction. She proposes recognizing classroom members as "observer-analysts" of their own interactions to further our understandings of knowledge construction, relationships, and social order in educational settings. "Referring closely and explicitly to how classroom members characterize who they are and what they are doing in the course of assembling their classroom interaction is a way of connecting researchers descriptions with those of classroom members" (Baker, 1992, p. 14).

Ethnographers of communication frequently seek data which provides descriptions of cultural terms utilized by speech community members to describe their own communicative practices (Baxter & Goldsmith, 1990). A rendering of student labels and categorizations of their participation in various interactions is one means of examining classroom peer group talk. Thus, Carbaugh's "Terms for Talk" (1989) analytic framework can be employed to identify interactive and dialogic accomplishments.

1. Talk and Talk-About-Talk

Carbaugh's system of analysis integrates two kinds of data -- talk and talk-about-talk -- "words about speech, but

also meanings and functions with reference to specific sociocultural scenes" (Carbaugh, 1989, p. 96). Ethnographic interpretation of particular activities and the meanings attributed to them evolve from movement between instantiations of the activities identified in the terms for talk and claims about their salience and functions. As such the framework incorporates insider and outsider perspectives into the examination of instances-of-the-terms-for-talk and features-of-the-talk (Carbaugh, 1989).

> ...Members of a classroom group develop common meanings for terms, patterned ways of interacting, and norms and expectations for how oral and written discourse is and will be accomplished. This referential system is constructed over time and is continually expanding and evolving as members interact with one another.
>
> Underlying this view of classroom communication is the understanding that members of a group are insiders in a culture, and as insiders, they understand the patterns of life in ways that visitors or outsiders may not (Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992b, p. 30).

By describing peer group talk from the point of view of the participants and using their terms for talk, this study will contribute to a better understanding of how students categorize, describe, and construct classroom events.

2. Identities Invoked in the "Terms for Talk"

Within any enactment of communication are underlying assumptions regarding a particular community's perceptions of personhood, status of the participants, and judgments about the talk itself that inform group member's interpretations of their interaction (Fitch, 1994). Within speech communities there are types of persons associated with specific terms for talk. Thus, enactments of the terms for talk are associated with different types of persons, messages about personhood, and cultural identity. Incorporating the specialized Hymesian vocabulary, Carbaugh referred to levels of enactment and types of messages conveyed in the communication. "When people label their speech, they invoke conceptions of personhood. We need to listen for these messages, especially as persons use them to construct their sense of communication acts, events, and styles" (1989, p. 112).

Notions of identity parallel to Carbaugh's have been elaborated as metaphors in educational studies: student as learner, student as worker, teacher as leader or learner (Marshall, 1994). The enactments of personhood or identities invoked in the conversations of the peer group I studied were those of 'student' and 'friend.' The particular roles of 'student' have also been studied by Collins and Green (1994), Chandler (1994), Floriani (1994), and others. The issue of friendships in the classroom has been less salient in education studies. Enactments of 'student' and 'friend' in the peer group I studied will be examined to explore issues

of identity connected to the "terms for talk" utilized by the students.

D. Hawaiian Interactional Patterns

In this section pertinent cultural aspects of Hawaiian face-to-face interactions will be reviewed. Knowledge of the Hawaiian culture enhanced my understanding of interactional patterns that emerged from the data. The literature reviewed here was used to identify Hawaiian norms of interaction and cross-cultural comparisons with my study.

The majority of literature reviewed originated from two long term research projects. The first was the Hawaiian Community Research Program[1] (HCRP), a five year anthropological and psychological investigation of contemporary Hawaiian culture and behavior. This information provided foundational ethnographic data (see Gallimore & Howard's 1979 Annotated Bibliography) for the second group of studies published by researchers at the Kamehameha Early Education Program.[2] KEEP was a research and development program founded in 1971 with the objective of developing, demonstrating, and disseminating effective methods to improve the education of academically at-risk Hawaiian students (Tanada-Matsumi & Tharp, 1977). For approximately two decades, a team of teachers, psychologists, anthropologists, and linguists engaged in the development, dissemination, and evaluation of a culturally congruent language arts program for Hawaiian children (kindergarten through third grade).

This literature represents the main body of Hawaiian educational research.

Two subcategories of Hawaiian interactional patterns follow. The first section provides a general description of the Hawaiian lifestyle and explains cultural premises and their historical significance. In the second section the discourse patterns of Hawaiian students are described. The educational studies focus on the KEEP language arts program which incorporated cultural features into the curriculum. Although the program was designed for students at the early elementary level, it has important implications regarding the significance of peer groups for Hawaiian students.

1. The Hawaiian Lifestyle

Hawaii is known as the 'land of aloha.' In the Hawaiian Dictionary (Pukui & Elbert, 1986) aloha is defined as :

> love, affection, compassion, mercy, sympathy, pity, kindness, sentiment, grace, charity; greeting, salutation, regards; sweetheart, lover, loved one; beloved, loving, kind, compassionate, charitable, lovable; to love, be fond of; to show kindness, mercy, pity, charity, affection; to venerate; to remember with affection; to greet, hail (1986, p. 21).

This cultural anomaly permeates all aspects of the Hawaiian lifestyle. Essential qualities of the aloha spirit include community caring, community giving, and community

feeling which are attributed to a love for the land and its first people (Adler & Pinao, 1993, p. 11). Thus, the spirit of aloha provides a connective thread woven within and across each of the interactional norms discussed in this section and is a dominant ideology of the Hawaiian lifestyle. Howard (1974) noted that a 'Hawaiian lifestyle' is not necessarily predicated on one's genealogy, but rather on the exemplification of values derived from ancestors of the Hawaiian islands.

In his study of contemporary issues in a Hawaiian community, Howard (1974) posited two conceptual cultural paradigms to delineate inherently conflicting social dynamics: *Polynesian-Hawaiian* and *Middle-American*. Characteristics of Polynesian-Hawaiians were similar to those of other small, isolated rural communities or certain urban neighborhoods relatively isolated from larger social systems where a close knit lifestyle is valued and has developed over time. A primary tenet of the Polynesian-Hawaiian cultural paradigm, rooted in the physical isolation of Hawaii and close proximity of island inhabitants, was "affiliation and the maintenance of interpersonal harmony... based upon the premise that social relationships take priority over all other concerns" (Howard, 1974, p. 206). The foundation of this system was an interactional hierarchy in which children were instructed to act appropriately with different groups of people. Of utmost importance were demonstrations of

deference and restraint with elders. Peer group interactions, however, were constituted more equitably.

> ...In the peer group, where ranking considerations are less pronounced, socialization focuses on training individuals to be responsive to the will of the group and strive for consensus. Persons who attempt to show off are ridiculed and ostracized since they are viewed as challenging the goals of group harmony and solidarity...
>
> In short...the Polynesian-Hawaiian lifestyle is oriented toward generating respect for rank, responsiveness to group will...
>
> Perhaps the most significant personal attribute generated by a successful socialization of the type described is an acute social sensitivity to others. This involves a capacity to remain passively attentive when one is in new situations or with individuals whose disposition is unknown. Only after an individual has learned something about other people's feelings and attitudes can he adjust his own behavior in the interest of interpersonal harmony (Howard, 1974, pp. 209-210).

In contrast, Howard (1974) described individual achievement as the priority of the Middle-American cultural paradigm. This lifestyle consists of continual challenges, achievements, and self-validation driven toward future accomplishments. Howard deemed this cultural paradigm as consistent with the dominant American educational ideology.

"The educational system favors children whose socialization histories are congruent with the Middle-American mode and ... the educational content presented in schools is heavily laden with the achievement ethic" (Howard, 1974, p. 224).

In a later publication, Gallimore and Howard (1968) utilized "minimax principle" to describe the Hawaiian norm of minimizing personal gain and maximizing interpersonal harmony. This principle implies an indifference to status on the part of Hawaiians that is sometimes misunderstood by outsiders. "It is simply that life in the dominant American society penalizes those whose sensitivities and values are affiliative -- rather than achievement -- oriented" (Gallimore & Howard, 1968, p. 12).

The general ideology of the Hawaiian lifestyle summarized here provides a foundation for the educational Hawaiian research reported in the next section. The dichotomy of the Polynesian-Hawaiian and Middle-American paradigms enabled me to better understand circumstances that might prove to be problematic for Hawaiian students in traditional educational settings.

2. Discourse Patterns of Hawaiian Students

The identification of cultural norms within the Hawaiian community provided data for researchers at the Kamehameha Early Education Program to identify potential problems in the classroom. Based on the earlier research of Gallimore, Boggs and Jordon (1974), Jordon, Au, and Joesting (1983, pp. 219-220) summarized five norms that differentiated

interactional patterns in Hawaiian homes from those commonly found in public schools. I have paraphrased pertinent aspects of those dimensions below (subheadings mine):

1. *Group versus individual achievements*

   From the time they are very young, Hawaiian children are taught to highly value their contributions to a smooth running household. Within the family unit and with peers, each member's contribution to the group is considered to be most important. Cooperation is highly valued whereas competition is viewed negatively. In the classroom, individual achievements are likely to be emphasized.

2. *Shared function organization*

   The structure of Hawaiian families is based on a "shared function" organization which involves role flexibility and joint responsibility, particularly within the sibling group. Hawaiian children are expected to complete certain chores as responsible members of the family work force. Obligations include taking care of younger siblings, washing dishes, cooking, cleaning, doing the laundry, yardwork, and other household chores. It is the responsibility of the sibling group to organize and divide this work. Thus, a certain amount of scheduling flexibility and freedom is built into the system and adjustments to various circumstances can be accommodated. In classroom

contexts, individual performance is the norm with little allowance for initiative or flexibility regarding responsibilities or scheduling.

3. *Indirect and non-intrusive adult supervision*

Adult supervision of children at home is characterized as non-intrusive and indirect, often mediated by older siblings. A major component of the family organization is "sibling caretaking." Older children oversee their younger siblings without adult intervention in routine matters. As a result, these children feel competent and autonomous. In school, however, it is usual for children's activities to be closely monitored by the teacher. A paradox emerges when the child is recognized as an important, contributing, and responsible member of the family; but an individual who must be closely supervised by the teacher in school. A Hawaiian child, even in the primary grades, might internalize the high degree of adult supervision in the classroom as indicating that the teacher believes the child to be incompetent.

4. *Children negotiate with each other, not adults*

As a result of the sibling caretaking network in Hawaiian homes, children learn to negotiate with each other to solve everyday problems, which usually renders adult interaction unnecessary. However, when an adult is displeased, children listen quietly to what the adult has to say and then withdraw from the scene.

They are taught that it is inappropriate and not respectful to explain or negotiate in these situations. Conversely, adults do not carry on at length about unpleasant matters, to do so is regarded as "picking" on the child. The child is scolded by the adult, then left alone. Many teachers have a tendency to elicit explanations from students when difficulties arise. To Hawaiian children, engagement in this type of negotiation equals "talking back," furthermore the teacher is depicted as ambiguous, vacillating between adult and peer roles.

5. *Strong peer group orientation*

The caretaking system in Hawaiian homes impels children to depend on and learn from siblings; and provide care, assistance, and information to those who are younger or less competent. A strong orientation to the peer group is prevalent, with much less reliance on adults. Teachers, on the other hand, generally expect students to consult them rather than classmates and may even regard peer interaction as disruptive and peer assistance as cheating.

These five concepts as well as other salient cultural issues were taken into consideration as members of the KEEP project developed classroom environments for Hawaiian children at their demonstration school. Specific areas

targeted included: classroom organization, instructional practices, and motivational management.

The organizational restructuring of the classrooms during reading instruction included approximately ten activity or learning centers. The children, five or six in a flexible grouping, were scheduled to be at the various centers at twenty to twenty-five minute intervals of the school day. This change in the classroom environment allowed the children to function in ways that were similar to their home environment, helping each other independent of adult direction. The "do your own work" rule of traditional classrooms was dropped and a more cooperative, child-centered, and culturally compatible approach was implemented (Vogt, Jordon & Tharp, 1987). "The independent work centers allowed the children a measure of the felt autonomy, competence, and trustworthiness to which they were accustomed at home" (Jordon, 1984, p. 66).

The new instructional approach utilized during the small group reading lessons emphasized the teachers' responsiveness to a linguistic event known in the Hawaiian culture as "talk story," characterized by overlapping speech, voluntary turn-taking, co-narration and joint constructions of the story (Vogt, Jordon & Tharp, 1987). Speidel (1987) noted that Hawaiian children engage in conversations much more readily if there is an opportunity for them to talk-story. This model of mutual participation was found to enhance comprehension because the instruction included a unique and

culturally responsive interaction between the teacher, the children, and the text (Au, 1980; Erickson, 1993).

The motivational aspect of the reading lessons was directly related to the active student involvement and the rapport established by the teacher. Hawaiian children seek a balance between warmth and toughness in themselves in gaining status with their peers. They similarly respect those qualities in their teachers. D'Amato, an anthropologist, identified the themes of warmth or solidarity and toughness or autonomy as forming the point and counterpoint of Hawaiian children's interactions (D'Amato, 1986; Vogt, Jordon & Tharp, 1987).

By providing children with literacy events at teacher-independent centers, using heterogeneous groupings and "a balance of rights" (Au, 1980) or shared control within the classroom, the program provided an approach compatible with the Hawaiian culture. Familiar language and participation structures allowed the students to engage in learning in ways consistent with their home culture. In turn, student participation and achievement increased.

In his study of resistance and compliance in minority classrooms D'Amato (1993, p. 201) emphasized that the imposition of competitive interactional models in Hawaiian schools resulted in student resistance. Conversely, classrooms adapted to the children's peer culture, with rivalrous rather than competitive structures and processes have been shown to be more effective. These types of

contexts are characterized as 'open' participation structures. In these contexts the groupings are small so that the students were not put on the spot in front of a large class audience and the teacher's authoritarian role was not center stage. Praise was distributed not for individual merit but for larger and more general commendations:

> Small-group instruction makes it possible for a child to perform in something less than the glare of full audience attention, and it reduces the teacher's visibility as a figure of authority. It enables her to experiment with the composition of work groups so as to avoid problem groupings and by that means to demonstrate to the children appreciation of and sensibility to their peer relationships. A small group organization also makes it possible for her to legitimize something that the children will do anyhow, namely, interact with their peers. In Hawaiian classrooms organized on a small-group basis, the peer interactions which occur in the groups not receiving direct instruction tend to be harmless, easily modulated by the children themselves, and often related to school work. It is only when the teacher forbids the interactions, as she almost must in the whole-group context, that they become interferences (D'Amato, 1993, p. 203; D'Amato 1986 cf. Bossert, 1979).

Standard classroom practices constitute forms of competition. D'Amato provides an insightful description of how peer group interactions of Hawaiian children can be affected by the direction of adults:

> Peer relationships defined and managed by peers are everywhere somewhat similar to one another and somewhat different from peer relationships defined and managed by adults or other superiors. The characteristic dynamic of the former is rivalry, of the later, competition. Rivalry and competition are similar to one another in being types of peer contention in which players try to win, but are quite different in their goals, processes, and values. In competition, one wins by establishing clear superiority over peers, typically through a judgment rendered by some sort of special standing above and beyond the fray. This game of peer contention celebrates disparity and has the effect of producing social differentiation, an hierarchy of achievement. Rivalry, on the other hand, is based upon ethic egalitarianism. One wins this contention by showing that one is as good as everyone else, that no one is better than oneself; the assertion of parity is estimated by the judgment of peers. Joking, and audience response to joking, is the paradigm of the process. Rivalry levels; it celebrates parity, and the successful management depends upon keeping the play with emergent preferences among peers from disturbing overall premises of balance and equity within the peer group (D'Amato, 1993, p. 198). [emphasis mine]

D' Amato emphasized equitable status or egalitarianism as a salient norm in Hawaiian peer group contexts.

In his long-term ethnographic study of talk among Hawaiian children in and out of school, Stephen Boggs (1985)

found an interesting phenomenon that began to occur in children between the ages of ten to twelve. As he spent time with adolescent boys in informal out-of-school settings, Boggs found that the younger boys developed a means of resolving conflicts as well as diminishing antagonistic feelings about these interactions that appeared to be a kind of hazing. The resultant consequences were a "scrupulous respect for equality among adolescents" (p. 39). Adolescents, both boys and girls, celebrated their equality by joking about assertiveness. This humor displaced what might otherwise be a dispute, in all but very serious circumstances. The humor functioned to produce as well as symbolize equality.

The literature reviewed in this section explicates Hawaiian norms of interaction and cultural issues that have been studied and addressed by one group of educational researchers and practitioners. Although the scope of the KEEP program was early elementary language arts instruction with a macro ethnographic emphasis, the literature provided cross-cultural comparisons to my micro ethnographic investigation of a group of seventh grade Hawaiian students in their English class.

E. Summary

This review of the literature provides descriptions of theoretical, methodological, and cultural issues relevant to my study of the conversations of a Hawaiian peer group in their seventh grade language arts classroom. My

investigation will contribute to the research summarized in this review. Specifically, student labels and descriptions of their peer group accomplishments will add another dimension to educational theory and research. Descriptions and interpretations of features of the talk, norms of interaction, roles, relationships and identities of the participants will contribute insights into the interrelationships of academic and social agendas in the classroom. Connections to the Hawaiian literature will extend the scope of the earlier cultural studies cited here.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A. Introduction

In order to address the research questions concerning what was being accomplished in the peer group interactions, ethnographic methods were utilized. A naturalistic research design was required to ascertain students' perceptions of their face-to-face interactions. The student labels and descriptions provided analytic categories for further interpretation and description from my perspective as the researcher. The methodology included participant observation, videotaping of naturally occurring classroom interactions, formal and informal interviewing during one school year. The process entailed ongoing, recursive data collection and analysis. Specifics regarding the research design, setting, participants, role of the researcher, data collection, and analysis will be expanded in this chapter.

B. The Setting

1. The School

The study was conducted at a middle school in Hawaii. The organization of the school featured teams of core academic teachers working together with an assigned group of approximately 110 students. At the seventh grade level, interdisciplinary teams included four teachers of the core academic subjects: social studies, science, math, and English. Special subject teachers conducted classes in physical education, keyboarding skills, music, art,

industrial arts, speech, and reading across teams and grade levels. Elective offerings included Hawaiian, French, or Spanish language classes; orchestra or band; and supervised study hall.

The daily schedule rotated through a six day cycle of seven 45 minute instructional periods. Therefore, class meeting times varied for each of the six days. Approximately twenty students were enrolled in each core academic class.

2. The Teacher

The opportunity to conduct research in Mrs. Smith's[3] classroom could be classified as a "reputation-case selection -- an instance chosen on the recommendation of experts in the area" (Merriam, 1988, p. 50). I chose to conduct my study in Mrs. Smith's classroom because of her reputation as an exceptional educator whose professional background included educational research, consulting, and numerous conference presentations. Mrs. Smith had twenty-three years of teaching experience, thirteen of those with Hawaiian children. She had been on staff at this particular middle school four years and was highly respected by her colleagues and students.

3. The Class

The seventh grade English language arts classroom was set up with four or five student desks grouped together to create 'tables.' Each of the tables was identified with a group number from one to five and referred to by the teacher as such, for example, "Everyone at Table #3 looks ready to

begin," or "Does Table #4 have a representative?" The teacher utilized this arrangement because 1) she believed it to be consistent with several studies regarding participation structures in the Hawaiian culture (as summarized in the literature review) and 2) because she believed social interactions become particularly important among adolescents and are an important middle school learning context. Thus, with the classroom structured in this way, student conversations were accepted and encouraged within certain parameters.

A point system encouraged peer group cooperation, organization, and participation (referred to as COP points). Group members, together and individually, could earn or lose points which were factored into report card grades and recorded regularly by the teacher on a clipboard she carried with her.

A daily agenda was written on a whiteboard in front of the classroom by the teacher and students were in the habit of reading it as they entered and prepared for class accordingly with other table members before the bell rang. Cooperative and collaborative peer group activities were regular features of the class. Skill areas to be covered in seventh grade English were specified in the school curriculum, but each teacher determined the form, content, and timing of units of study. General curriculum strands included: reading comprehension, composition, research

skills, writing for tests, process writing, literature, vocabulary, grammar, and study skills.

C. The Student Participants

The students[4] in Mrs. Smith classes were of part-Hawaiian ancestry[5] and came from various socioeconomic backgrounds. The peer group selected as the focus of study was chosen for several reasons:

- Their table was nearest to the electrical outlets in the back of classroom, so video-taping from two angles was possible without intruding into Mrs. Smith's teaching area.

- Their class met just before one of Mrs. Smith's preparation periods, so she and I had time to discuss various aspects of the research as was necessary.

- I easily developed a rapport with the students and observed that from the time that the group first formed, right after Thanksgiving recess, there was almost always conversation between the participants.

- Each of the students was a willing participant in the study.

The focus group was also known as Table #3 in English class. The two girls in the group were Leilani and Malia, and two boys, Kaipo and Pono. Each had attended a different elementary school, so they had no previous school history together. The teacher described the group members as within the average range in terms of their academic grades and language arts skills.

1. Leilani

One of the most vocal group members was Leilani, an outgoing and boisterous adolescent. She was also the most temperamental participant. Thus, Leilani's mood and attitude varied and these differences affected the group. Whether in an upbeat mood, angry, or upset, Leilani usually spoke her mind. She conscientiously attended to language arts assignments, but was not an overly serious student. Leilani's forthright nature during formal and informal interviews contributed greatly to my understanding of the group interactions.

2. Malia

Malia was a rather quiet, hard working student actively involved in various team sports throughout the year. The oldest of a large family, Malia had many responsibilities in organizing the sibling work force at home. Her ability to assess situations and people was evident in her contributions to the group. In her own unique, low-key manner, Malia brought stability to Table #3, though she also enjoyed fooling around. Her demeanor remained quite consistent,

Malia didn't always have much to say, but when she did her peers listened.

3. Kaipo

Kaipo was the more vocal of the two boys. He appeared to be quite comfortable with his classmates and readily shared his opinions, which were numerous. Kaipo could be described as the most intellectual group member. He seemed to be fascinated with learning unique information, for example, the uses of embalming fluid, or what it would be like to experience a snowstorm. Kaipo and Leilani, as the two most vocal members of the group, sometimes became exasperated with each other but also established a close and special friendship.

4. Pono

Pono and Leilani referred to each other as siblings. Their relationship can be used to describe Pono; he was like a brother to his peers -- pleasant, amicable, and often instrumental in resolving problems at Table #3. Pono was an earnest student, but the group member who experienced the most difficulty with academics. He often consulted other group members for explanations of assignments or concepts presented in class but seemed to work to the best of his ability at all times.

D. Design of the Study

Recursive movement back-and-forth between data collection and analysis was an inherent requirement of this

ethnographic study. The iterative process involved continual movement within and across the following phases:

- Videotaping the focus peer group, conducting formal and informal interviews of the participants, recording field notes, and collecting pertinent written documents.

- Interrogating both the recorded data and reflections on talk offered by informants in formal and informal interviews, written documents, and field notes for culture-specific categories or "terms for talk" (Fitch, 1994 reference to Carbaugh, 1989).

- Examining instances of the prominent "terms for talk" with an eye toward identifying topics and features-of-the-talk; norms of interaction; tone of the conversations; roles, relationships, and identities of the peer group members.

- Moving back and forth between the literature and the data to refine analytic categories and identify cross-cultural comparisons and contrasts.

The instances of interaction I focused on were student-student conversations. Interrogation of the data resulted in

identification of salient student "terms for talk" and corresponding descriptions or talk-about-talk. Instances of the student categories were then analyzed to delineate features-of-the-talk and explore instantiations of personhood and identity invoked by the participants.

1. Role of the Researcher

As a participant-observer in Mrs. Smith's classes, my role varied somewhat throughout the study, but primarily was that of an observer with limited participation. I introduced myself to the students as an educator interested in their peer group talk: what topics they discussed, how they participated, and what they accomplished. Both the teacher and I stressed my interest in "normal" everyday kinds of conversations, and emphasized that there was no need for the students to censor language usage or conversational topics because of my presence, the teacher, a tape recorder or video camera.

2. Parameters of the Research

The study was conducted from November 1, 1992 through May 27, 1993, the last day of school. Data collection included field notes written in a notebook I carried with me at all times, a researcher journal written at home to note my feeling and personal reflections regarding the study, audiotapes of interviews, videotapes of classes and one group interview.

From the onset my attention was directed to the conversations between the small groups of students sitting at

each of the tables in the classroom. The composition of those groups was the choice of the students at the start of the school year. Later, Mrs. Smith planned the seating arrangement but asked for student input regarding table mates. Once decisions were finalized, the seating arrangement remained constant for a period of time, usually one marking term or trimester. The group I selected for the focus of this study worked together for approximately six months. The groupings for that particular class remained stable from late November until the end of the school year to accommodate my research interests.

I recorded the daily agenda posted by the teacher and descriptions of large class discussions and teacher presentations in my field notes. Therefore, a variety of classroom interactional configurations were recognized as dimensions of the instructional context. However, the parameters of my research focus and microanalysis were student-student interactions.

E. Data Collection

During the "grand tour" (Spradley, 1980) period I followed the schedule of the seventh grade students, ate lunch in the cafeteria, attended assembles, and so on. The students became accustomed to my presence and I learned more about the school culture. Early on the students engaged in "small talk" with me, especially between classes. Overall, I felt welcomed and comfortable very quickly and began to

unobtrusively ask questions about the classroom, school activities, the Hawaiian language and culture.

At first, I only recorded data in the form of field notes from a seat in the back of the classroom. After a few weeks, I brought in the video camera and recorded one group of students during each class period. I continued to take field notes of the larger class context as well as particularities of the group being taped. During this period the students adjusted to the presence of the video camera.

After the Thanksgiving recess the peer groupings were changed in a process that involved student choices and teacher decisions. The focus group was identified at that time and were videotaped daily for most of the remainder of the school year.

At two intervals during the study the typical 'table' peer groups were replaced with different interactional configurations. A special inter-disciplinary unit during the month of February involved combined English and social studies classes in a research project on Hawaiian culture. During that time I functioned as an assistant-teacher, my participation included helping with library research, conferencing with students, proof-reading written drafts, and checking homework. I was able to interact with and get to know all of Mrs. Smith's students from a different perspective as they shared aspects of their progress and research with me. When this project was completed the

classroom organization returned to the peer groups described earlier.

For approximately three weeks in April, the class was divided into two groups. Each group read and discussed an assigned novel. During this period I recorded data in the form of field notes.

At regular intervals I invited the four participants to attend lunch meetings for informal conversations. The meetings were tape recorded and student feedback was used to validate my findings. Loosely structured individual interviews were conducted with each of the four participants late in May. Each of these audio taped sessions were fully transcribed.

1. Narrowing the Focus

The primary sources of analysis were interview data and videotapes of the focus group during their daily English language arts class.

The first formal group interview was conducted February 2, during lunch. Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono had expressed an interest in watching one of my videotapes so they could "see themselves on T.V." I videotaped this viewing session in order to capture their reactions and comments. The quality of the sound was poor because the television conversations and student reactions blended together. Nevertheless, I was able to note instances of usage of the terms for talk "doing English" and "socializing" which I had previously noted in the data.

The following day, I met with the group again during lunch and asked them to tell me about their peer group conversations. My questions included:

- What do you talk about?
- How does the group work?
- What gets accomplished?

Full transcription of this interview was not possible because of the many instances of overlapping speech by all of the group members. However, after listening to the audiotape repeatedly, I was able to again note numerous usages of "doing English" and "socializing." The following week, at an informal lunch meeting, I shared these initial categories with the group and verified their interpretations of the two distinct activity forms. As such, the terms-for-talk "doing English" and "socializing" became the two basic categories of analysis. Additional interview data and segments of student letters written to incoming seventh graders during the last week of school were used to compile descriptions of the terms for talk from the perspective of the students.

Instantiations of "doing English" and "socializing" were captured on videotape, the camera recorded all activity of the focus group for a particular day. I videotaped the focus group on 46 days between November 30, 1992 and May 12, 1993, Figure 3.1 lists the videotaping dates.

Table 3.1: Videotaping Dates

November	30
December	1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16
January	5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22
March	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
April	26, 27 ,28, 29
May	3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12

2. Selection of Videotapes

The data reduction process involved indexing tape content with the aim of identifying specific segments in which student-student conversations occurred. Small segments of such talk was recorded regularly at the beginning of the class, before the bell rang, while group members informally conversed and prepared for the daily agenda listed on the whiteboard. Similarly, at the end of class, as students prepared to leave, small segments of informal talk were recorded. Longer segments of peer group interactions, either to complete a specified assignment or manage free style work periods were videotaped during the various units of study. Next, these segments were scanned for the visual and auditory clarity needed for transcription.

As the data collection process continued segments of videotapes were transcribed to more closely study the

interactional patterns. As the end result of this funneling process three segments of videotape were selected for complete transcription and microanalysis. The videotapes selected were representative of the variety of peer group interactions recorded across the larger corpus of data. Additionally, two of the transcripts included the lengthiest segments of student-student conversations recorded during the study on a given day. Each of these transcripts represent peer group talk for most of an entire class period, therefore, more in-depth analysis was possible.

Transcript #1, recorded on March 3, represents approximately 45 minutes of peer group talk. In this class the group worked to complete a teacher-directed assignment. The instructions were to collaboratively determine the plot line of a short story from their English anthology. This transcript depicts a salient form of group activity across the data; collaborative engagement in a literacy task assigned by the teacher. The results were then shared with the whole class in a follow-up discussion. The atypical aspect of this transcript was the disharmony among the group members.

Transcript #2, recorded on March 11, represents approximately 15 minutes of conversation. This excerpt depicts the focused, brief, cooperative events that occurred almost daily across the larger corpus of data. Most often students shared responses to reading or their own writing. In this transcript each of the group members shared their

written responses to a teacher query regarding the main character of a short story.

Transcript #3 represents the entire 45 minute March 18 class. During this student work session several tasks were to be completed in this order of importance: 1) vocabulary poster, 2) reading log, 3) pleasure reading. Here the students determined their activity engagement within the parameters of the classroom context. This transcript depicts student-directed activity engagement which was contrasted with the teacher-directed events shown in Transcripts #1 and #2.

Thus, the three transcripts depict the range of peer group interactions recorded across the data: collaborative teacher-directed activities, cooperative teacher-directed activities, and student-directed work periods. Examination of contrasting elements provided a means to explore the norms of interaction at work within the peer group.

F. Analysis of the Videotaped Data

Analysis of the selected videotapes included systematic transcription, conversational analysis, coding of the interactional patterns, delineation of topic patterns, and identification of salient interactional patterns connected to the research questions.

1. Transcription

For the purposes of this study, transcription involved selection of conventions and division of the transcribed text into topic units and message units.

a. Conventions

The transcription conventions utilized were adapted from Goodwin's system (1990, pp. 25-26) which derived from Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974):

[Overlap Bracket: left brackets indicate overlapping speech.

?.,! Intonation: punctuation marks indicate intonational changes. A period signals falling contour; a question mark signals rising contour; a comma signals falling-rising contour; an exclamation point signals emphasized contour.

- - Lengthening: dashes indicate elongation of pronunciation for emphasis.

( ) Comments: parentheses enclose information that is not part of the spoken talk, for example, indicating laughter or providing a commentary on spoken text.

(( )) Problematic Hearing: double parentheses indicate inaudible segments of transcript.

b. Topic Units

Each topic unit was a segment of conversation around one general subject. Brief, temporary shifts in topic within a larger, ongoing topic unit were not distinguished in this transcript segmentation process. When the demarcation between topic units was not clear, message units were kept within one unit until another topic unit was clearly distinguished (Phinney, 1992). On the transcript, each topic unit was labeled with the videotaping date, topic unit number

and title. These lines of information served to divide the transcripts and indicated changes in topic.

c. Message Units

Green and Wallat defined message units as "the minimal unit of conversational meaning on the part of the speaker" (1981, p. 196). As any number of next moves are possible in the moment-by-moment progression of a conversation it is only by utilizing post hoc analysis that the contextualization cues used by the participants can be determined. On the transcripts, each message unit was assigned a separate numbered line. Thus, each word or group of words that conveyed a separate message by definition or intonational stress was designated as a message unit. The following transcript segment will be used to illustrate how message units were determined:

245	Malia:	What's it all about?
246		[Is it a story?
247	Leilani:	[It's a story.
248	L & M:	(Laugh)
249	Malia:	Don't sound like a beginning to me!
250		Sounds like a ending!
251	Leilani:	(Laughing) 'Kay, listen!
252		(Reads) They looked at each other,
253		and they started to look up,
254		and the
255		and the moons orbited.

In line 245, Malia asked a question represented as one single message unit. There was no pause in her utterance. Lines 246 followed the same pattern as Malia asked a follow-up question (line 246) uttered without a pause. Leilani's response statement, "It's a story." (line 247), was a complete sentence and represented one message unit. The laughter of Leilani and Malia was denoted as a message unit (line 248) to indicate that their nonverbal interaction separated the spoken message units in lines 247 and 249. The utterances in lines 249 and 250 represented two flows of language, exclamation points at the end of each line signal emphasized contour in Malia's assessment of Leilani's writing. Line 251 represents a single message unit. The change in intonation indicated that Leilani was being comical in directing the attention of Malia to her writing in line 251, "'Kay listen!" Again the exclamation point indicated emphasized contour. The division of message units in lines 252 and 253 were marked with commas to denote falling contour. In line 254, the message unit "and the," the flow of language was broken off with a pause. Line 255, repeated and completed the utterance of the preceding message unit. The period at the end of line 255 "and the moons orbited." signaled falling contour and closure of the message unit.

2. Topic Patterns

The delineation of topic patterns provided a method for determining whether the back-and-forth pattern of "doing

English - socializing - doing English - socializing" put forth by the students could be substantiated in the data and to what degree. The topic patterns provided quantifications of variety and frequency of particular topics of conversation recorded on each videotaped excerpt as well as the numbers of corresponding message units.

3. Data Coding Sheets

Formulation of the Data Coding Sheets required recursive movement back and forth between the data, literature, and the various drafts of coding matrixes (adapted from Phinney, 1992). The process involved continual reconstructions and refinements which resulted the final product seen in Figure 3.1, Blank Data Coding Sheet.

Salient dimensions of the peer group talk were reflected in the five categories delineated on the Data Coding Sheets: content, source, form, stance, and interactional strategies. The process of coding each transcription line provided a record of communicative activity across the five categories. The completed Data Coding Sheets provided evidence of salient patterns that were reexamined in the discursive research process for further description and interpretation presented as findings.

DATA CODING SHEET

Transcript Date: Topic:

TRANSCRIPTION LINE																													
CONTENT																													
"Doing English"																													
"Socializing"																													
SOURCE																													
Leilani																													
Malia																													
Kaipo																													
Pono																													
Other																													
FORM																													
Statement																													
Question																													
Response																													
Other																													
STANCE																													
Individual Autonomy																													
Group Affiliation																													
Inter. Strategies																													
Monitoring																													
Requesting																													
Agreeing																													
Disagreeing																													
Directing																													
Repeating																													
Announcing																													
Claiming																													
Contradicting																													
Assessing																													
Complimenting																													
Pulling away																													
Suggesting																													
Ignoring																													
Using humor																													
Confirming																													
Clarifying																													
Grumbling																													
Bragging																													
Scolding																													

Figure 3.1: Sample Data Coding Sheet

a. Content

Based on the terms for talk framework of Carbaugh, the *Content* of each message unit indicated activity involvement as either *"Doing English"* or *"Socializing."* These categories represented student labels for their interactions. Transcription lines were indexed "doing English," "socializing," or both. "Doing English" referred to talk specifically related to the English language arts curriculum, including: classroom projects, materials, procedures, reading, writing, spelling, sharing, and so on. "Socializing" was defined as all non-language arts talk, including: other classes, friends, problems, clothes, hair, boyfriends, girlfriends, activities, and so on. The interpersonal identities of 'student' and 'friend' corresponded with the terms for talk: "doing English" depicted being a student; "socializing" depicted being a friend.

b. Source

Source referred to the person or persons who verbalized the transcript line or message unit. Possible sources included Leilani, Malia , Kaipo, Pono, or other (used to indicate a speaker who was not a member of the focus peer group).

c. Form

The *Form* of each message unit referred to the discourse form in which the message unit was presented (Phinney, 1992, p. 250): response, statement, question, or other.

d. Stance

Stance defined the direction of intra or interpersonal identity instantiated at a particular moment in time (Goodwin, 1990; r.f. Goffman). Goodwin explained stance in this way: "a speaker can display an alignment toward her own talk or actions or toward other parties and the events in progress" (1990, p. 74). Message units aligned toward one's self were coded *Individual Autonomy* while message units aligned toward others were coded *Group Affiliation.* These categories were adopted from the Hawaiian and mainland literature reviewed in Chapter II because the terms accurately depicted forms of action displayed by the peer group members. Each transcript line represented one stance or the other, either individual autonomy or group affiliation.

e. Interactional Strategies

Interactional Strategies delineated linguistic purpose or socially directive behavior (Bloome, 1992; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993). More than one out of the possible twenty interactional strategies could be coded for a particular line of transcript. I constructed definitions for each strategy by adapting dictionary definitions to reflect particular activities enacted by members of the focus peer group. Therefore the descriptions are not intended to portray dictionary definition accuracy. Illustrative lines of transcript follow each interactional strategy definition:

Monitoring - Overseeing others to regulate, supervise, keep track of activity engagement; admonish or assist in keeping order.

- "Are you doin' a story?"

- "Why is Kaipo over there now?"

Requesting - Asking for something to be given or done; soliciting assistance or feedback.

- "How we gonna finish?"

- "What do you think is best?"

Agreeing - Being of one mind; reaching consensus; complying with a preference; harmonizing in opinion or feeling.

- "Oh, okay."

- "Yeah, I think so."

Disagreeing - Failing to agree; disputing; differing in opinion; presenting an opposite view point.

- "I wouldn't do that to Kaipo."

- "No, never mind."

Directing - Focusing the attention of others; guiding the conversation in a particular direction or to a particular topic.

- "Just talk about this (points to poster)."

- "All right guys listen to this."

Repeating - Saying or doing something again; reiterating the principle points of or referring to a previous discourse or interaction.

- "Let me see

  Let me see the pencil."

- "This is when he first cuts him."

Announcing - Proclaiming or asserting; making known publicly; sharing some sort of news.

- "I'm gonna break up."

- "I watched M.T.V. all day yesterday."

Claiming - Asserting ownership of material, space, concept, or stance; maintaining as a fact.

- "This is my, my, my picture."

- "Because I don't wanna get busted."

Contradicting - Denying categorically; presenting an opposing view point; implying denial.

- "Don't sound like a beginning to me."

- "That's not what I meant."

Assessing - Judging someone or something; making an evaluation of a person, item, or situation.

- "That's gross!"

- "Don't sound like a beginning to me."

Complimenting - Positive recognition of another's accomplishment; bestowing praise; admiring.

- "My my my!"

- "Yeah, your paragraph was good."

Pulling away - Physically or emotionally moving away from others; drawing toward oneself.

- "Don't TELL me."
- "I got to do this myself."

Suggesting - Cautiously offering advice or assistance; prompting consideration or action.

- "I think this is backwards."
- "Then, do your reading record."

Ignoring - Refraining from noticing or recognizing; disregarding.

- *Signaled by change in subject
  or other indication by listeners
- "Is anybody listening? Is anybody listening?"
  "I guess not."

Using Humor - Being or attempting to be comical or amusing.

- "Liar, liar, pants on fire!"
- (Laughter)

Confirming - Establishing the truth, accuracy, validity, or genuineness of a previous message; verifying; making certain.

- "This is when he first cuts him.
  Then he's relieved."
- "I would have arrested Bobby."

Clarifying - Restating more clearly or in another way to increase comprehension or validity.

- "I just wanted to know."
- "I was just joking."

Grumbling - Complaining sullenly.

- "I can't find any pictures of snobby people."
- "I hate these dumb things!"

Bragging - Using boastful or arrogant language; complementing oneself.

- "Nice yeah? My lettering."
- "I WAS right, it's ninety!"

Scolding - Reprimanding or chiding another for inappropriate activity.

- "You're not supposed to write summary things!"
- "What the hell are you guys doin'?"

G. Analysis of Field Notes, Interview Data, and Documents

The textual analysis methodology of Egan-Robertson (1994) was adapted to index field notes, transcripts of group and individual interviews, and written documents in order to determine values, attitudes, feelings, meanings, and purposes the participants attributed to their face-to-face interactions. Excerpts indexed in the textual analysis process provided documentation of talk-about-talk which was employed to describe and identify features of the activities represented in the student terms for talk.

H. Connections to Research Questions

Data utilized to answer the first research question -- student perceptions of the talk -- included excerpts from field notes, interview data, and student letters indexed in the textual analysis process as well as segments of transcripts selected for microanalysis. The student identified terms for talk "doing English" and socializing" provided the basic analytic categories of this study. Textual instances of talk-about-talk were used to describe the two forms of action from the point of view of the participants.

Analysis responsive to the second research question -- features of the talk -- included conversational analysis, identification of topic patterns, and coding of transcript data. Communicative features which characterized academic and social engagement were rendered from the perspective of the researcher and include two salient categories of findings: 1) differentiating "doing English" and "socializing" and 2) maintaining group harmony.

The third research question -- relationships and identities enacted in the talk -- was addressed by examining interview data and transcripts from the combined perspectives of the participants and researcher to determine what it meant to be a student in this particular class and peer group. Intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions explored include: individual autonomy, group affiliation, and identities implicit in the terms for talk.

I. Permission to Conduct Research

Written permission to conduct research for this dissertation was granted by the school authorities, English Department Head at the school, the Human Subjects Review Committee of the University of Massachusetts, and parents of the student participants.

J. Limitations of the Study

This ethnographic study of peer group interactions took place in one classroom in Hawaii and focused on one four member group of students. The findings are not applicable to other seventh grade English language arts classrooms or even to other peer groups within the same classroom. The norms of interaction that were identified are context specific and are not generalizations; however, the insights offered could be used to examine other classroom contexts.

One limitation of the study was the focus on student terms for talk and instantiations of those activities. The data selected for analysis included naturally occurring student-student interactions. Although the influence of the teacher was recognized, student-teacher dynamics were not an area of this investigation.

A second limitation of the study related to the form of text analyzed. The corpus of data encompassed spoken language in the form of peer group conversations. The only references to written texts were those which explicated dimensions of the face-to-face interactions. Examinations of

intertextual and intercontextual relationships would illuminate additional complexities of classroom life.

The limitations of this study relate to the focus on one peer group and research perspective. However, a focused study is necessary to better understand social and academic issues of classroom life and the significance of peer group learning contexts. Ethnographic research allows for the study of moment-by-moment social constructions within the face-to-face interactions which combine the perspectives of the students and researcher.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

A. Introduction and Overview

In this chapter the findings from an ethnographic investigation of peer group talk in a Hawaiian seventh grade language arts classroom are presented. More specifically, the conversations that took place among four students were the focus of study. My intention was to examine what was being accomplished in these face-to-face interactions. The findings are organized to address the three research questions: 1) How did the students label and describe their interactive accomplishments? 2) What communicative features characterized academic and social engagement? 3) What relationships and identities were enacted in the peer group talk? Within the recursive ethnographic design of the study, student perceptions of their conversations were elicited in order to understand the participants' perspective and labels used to categorize their talk. The first level analysis, or the student perspective, is elaborated in section B of this chapter. The first level findings, along with references to the literature, provided the foundation for further examination of communicative features of the conversations, relationships and identities of the peer group members described in sections C and D.

B. Student Perceptions of the Talk

The data used to present the student labels and descriptions of their conversations include interviews,

writing samples, field notes, and transcript excerpts. When Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono were asked to write about or orally explain what was accomplished in their peer group interactions, three themes emerged: 1) student labels categorized social and academic conversations; 2) becoming a group was a process; 3) maintaining harmony was significant. Each of these areas will be expanded in the next sections.

1. "Doing English" and "Socializing"

After the "grand tour"(Spradley, 1979) phase of the study, I met informally with Leilani, Malia, Kaipo and Pono. One question I posed to the group was, "What do you talk about?" They responded:

001	Malia:	[Other classes
002	Kaipo:	[Homework
003	Leilani:	Socializing
004	Pono:	Yeah
005		away from doing English
006		[All the time
007	Leilani:	[All the time
008	Malia:	Yeah
009	Kaipo:	Doing English, socializing
010	Leilani:	Yeah like that
011		Socializing, doing English,
012	L&M&K&P:	Socializing, doing English,
013		Back-and-forth

Interested in factors that influenced their activity involvement in one direction or the other, I asked how they knew when to engage in "doing English" or "socializing." Kaipo responded:

> We' ll do our work. So like when she (the teacher) checks our notebooks like we' ll have it and if it' s a work period we know that we need it in our book, notebook, so go back. And if she' s not talking about anything, nothing' s going on, then we might talk again and then go back to work, like that.

Kaipo' s statement implied that it was necessary for the students to accurately interpret cues in the classroom context, especially those of the teacher, moment-by-moment in order to determine when to engage in "doing English" or "socializing." Leilani explained the group interactions this way:

> Actually, half the time we talk about English and the other half talk about social stuff; boys, or girls, or our friends. The four of us all talk...Sometimes you just do it and you never realize you' re doing it. Because like if you' re doing English, something may remind you of what happened. And then you say, oh yeah, and then you start talking about it because of something that triggered your mind, that made you think about it.

In this anecdote we can see that an academic topic might lead to an off-task or social conversation. Next, Kaipo explained that, at times, group members directed each other to "doing English":

> Somebody on the table might tell you, oh you have to get back on the subject because Mrs. Smith might yell at you or something like that.

Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono repeatedly referred to a back-and-forth interactional pattern of "doing English - socializing - doing English - socializing." They defined "doing English" as encompassing academic activities specifically related to the language arts curriculum. "Socializing" was differentiated as any interaction not related to the English class activities, such as talk about other classes, friends, problems, and other topics. The students' definition of "socializing" included all interactions that they considered 'not doing English' including academic conversations related to subjects other than language arts class. These student categorizations and labels for their interactions provided my rationale for coding message units as "doing English" or "socializing." In that way the data analysis was based, in part, on the perspective of the students. I coded all language arts related message units as "doing English" and all message units that were off-task, or not related to the language arts

curriculum as "socializing." The two transcript excerpts below illustrate this distinction.

In the first excerpt, all message units related to the language arts activity of composing a group response to a poem, therefore, each was coded "doing English."

January 6 - Group Response to Poem

030	Leilani:	Well,
031		What are we gonna say?
032	Malia:	(Laughs)
033		The whole poem.
034	Leilani:	Why don't we just say
035		that
036		[if you're gonna be sad
037	Pono:	[You better do things
038		about the stuff in the future,
039		that hasn't happened.
040	Leilani:	No!
041		That's not what the author is saying.
042		The author is saying that
043		if you're gonna be sad about something
044		be sad about things that are
045		[(Laughs)
046	Kaipo:	[Okay teacher.
047	Pono:	[Things that are undone.
048	Leilani:	[Things that aren't

049 that you haven' t

050 dreamed of

051 [until

052 Kaipo: [Until you' re

053 Pono: Twenty

054 Kaipo: Forty

055 Pono: A hundred

056 Kaipo: A billion years old.

057 (to Leilani) You can say it

058 I guess.

059 (to Pono) Come on write it down.

DATA CODING SHEET #1

Transcript Date: *January 6* **Topic:** *Group Response to Poem*

TRANSCRIPTION LINE	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
CONTENT																											
"Doing English"	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
"Socializing"																											
SOURCE																											
Leilani	●	●			●	●	●				●	●	●	●	●	●			●	●	●	●					
Malia			●	●																							
Kaipo																		●					●		●		●
Pono								●	●	●							●							●		●	
Other																											
FORM																											
Statement	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Question		●																									
Response											●						●										
Other			●													●											
STANCE																											
Individual Autonomy																											
Group Affiliation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Inter. Strategies																											
Monitoring																	●										
Requesting		●																									
Agreeing						●																	●				
Disagreeing					●					●	●																
Directing	●	●																									
Repeating																				●	●	●	●				
Announcing					●	●																		●	●	●	●
Claiming												●	●	●	●												
Contradicting										●	●																
Assessing										●	●						●			●	●	●					
Complimenting																											
Pulling away																											
Suggesting	●			●	●	●	●	●	●									●	●								
Ignoring																											
Using humor			●													●	●										
Confirming																		●	●						●	●	●
Clarifying												●	●	●	●					●	●	●					
Grumbling																											
Bragging																											
Scolding																											

Figure 4.1: Data Coding Sheet #1

In the next transcript excerpt, all of the message units were coded "socializing" because the conversational meaning of each message unit was not connected to the English language arts curriculum. In this segment Kaipo and Leilani discussed an after school activity. Kaipo wanted Leilani to show him where the soda machine was located at the end of the school day.

March 18 - Topic #26 - Activities

544	Kaipo:	Leilani can we go please?
545	Leilani:	Why?
546	Kaipo:	Fine
547		I went with you to Ms. Weeks.
548	Leilani:	So?
549		(Laughs)
550		When
551		When do you want me to go?
552	Kaipo:	After school
553	Leilani:	I can't.
554	Kaipo:	After the bookstore.
555	Leilani:	I can't.

DATA CODING SHEET #2

Transcript Date: *March 18* **Topic:** *#26 Activities*

TRANSCRIPTION LINE	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555
CONTENT												
"Doing English"												
"Socializing"	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
SOURCE												
Leilani		●			●	●	●	●		●		●
Malia												
Kaipo	●		●	●					●		●	
Pono												
Other												
FORM												
Statement				●			●				●	
Question	●	●			●			●				
Response			●						●	●		●
Other						●						
STANCE												
Individual Autonomy												
Group Affiliation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Inter. Strategies												
Monitoring												
Requesting	●	●					●	●				
Agreeing												
Disagreeing										●		
Directing	●						●	●				
Repeating												
Announcing			●	●								
Claiming					●				●	●		●
Contradicting					●							
Assessing			●	●								
Complimenting												
Pulling away												
Suggesting									●		●	
Ignoring												
Using humor						●						
Confirming				●								
Clarifying		●		●			●	●				●
Grumbling												
Bragging												
Scolding												

Figure 4.2: Data Coding Sheet #2

The main point was that the students acknowledged and labeled social and academic endeavors in this classroom context. The salience of both forms of action to the adolescent participants was reflected in the back-and-forth pattern of "doing English - socializing - doing English - socializing" they described. The pattern depicted both forms of action as significant to the students.

2. Becoming a Group

A primary accomplishment of the students was that they became a group. The four individuals considered themselves members of Table #3. Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono reported that their history was significant. Their identity as a group developed as the four individuals learned more about each other, grew more comfortable with each other and interacted readily. Thus, an interesting juxtaposition in the evolution of the group was revealed: group members learned more about each other through their conversations; and they spoke to each other more freely and frequently as they became better acquainted.

The interview segment that follows explains the process of becoming a group in the words of the participants:

Pono: In a new group you have to start all over again, about friends and stuff, yeah? And they'll be embarrassed when you're embarrassed, yeah?

Malia: I didn't really feel like talking at first because, I don't know, I felt -- embarrassed or something because I didn't know the people. Then we just started talking and then, I don't know, we just-- we just became friends.

Kaipo: I guess at the beginning, Mrs. Smith just put us together and then like we kept talking and we'd write things down about our group so we know each other. And after that, after that-- we'd always say hi to each other in passing periods. And every day we try to learn like something different from each other.

Pono: We just talked together and stuff like that, about our social life and all kine stuff, what happened in the past an' stuff, about problems and stuff.

Kaipo: Like before Mrs. Smith starts talking, we just talk story a little. Like sometimes somebody will come in an' like something exciting happened in their class before, so we'll just go down to that. Before, at the beginning of the year, we didn't know each other. So when we formed the group it got better and better for me. We knew each other much better.

Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono felt strange and uncomfortable when they were first assigned to sit together because they didn't know each other very well and the risk of embarrassment was a concern. The topic that served to 'break the ice' was other school subjects including: science, math, social studies, health, art, or physical education. As members of the same middle school academic team, the students were all taught by the same teachers but each had a different schedule of classes during the school day. Thus, asking each other about another class provided a means to engage in a conversation that was relevant and 'safe.' Different school subjects provided topics of conversation that each of the four participants could engage in, but that were impersonal enough not to be threatening or embarrassing. In the conversational data other classes were almost always the topic of discussion before the bell rang and English class officially started. The following transcript excerpt regarding the lei-making contest in social studies class typified such interactions.

<u>February 21 - Before Class Talk</u>

001	<u>Leilani</u>:	What kind flowers you gonna bring?
002		Tomorrow
003		For socials (social studies)
004		For the contest?
005	<u>Malia</u>:	Prob'ly ipo
006	<u>Leilani</u>:	[Ipu? (mispronunciation of the word)

007 Both: [(laugh)

008 Malia: [No,

009 Ipo,

010 Means sweetheart.

011 Leilani: I know a girl named Ipo

012 Malia: [Yeah

013 Leilani: [In eighth grade.

014 Both: [(Laugh)

(Bell rings for start of class)

Individual interview data collected in January reiterated the importance of talk about other classes as the common denominator in the initial conversations and collective identity building of the peer group. Note that each of the group members knew which class their peers were scheduled to attend the periods before English. That knowledge enabled them to ask questions regarding those classes. In the following interview segments, the students shared related insights.

[Q = my questions; A = student responses]

Malia's Interview

Q. What did you talk about at first?

A. Well, they tell us about -- because Kaipo comes straight from socials, yeah, so I ask him what we do there. And then I come from

math and Pono asks me what we did in there. And then Leilani comes in from Hawaiian and asks us what we did.

Kaipo's Interview

Q. What did you talk about at first?

A. I get here first and get out the notebooks. Oh, I guess my class is the closest, because Pono comes from science, Leilani comes from Hawaiian, and Malia comes from math. And like somebody will come in, like something exciting happened in their class before, so we'll just go down to that.

Q. What kinds of things would you talk about?

A. We just talk about the class and what's for homework, if class is going to be fun--stuff like that before Mrs. Smith starts class.

Pono's Interview

Q. So what do you talk about?

A. Like before the bells rings talk about what's math homework, or what's the socials assignment, like that. Like if we're havin' a test in math and you're the only one that didn't go yet, so you ask people is the test hard? What kinda questions had and all kine --like that.

Other instantiations of "socializing" from the data exemplify types of information shared within the peer group. In the first segment Pono had just returned to school after being absent for three days with a severe cold and sore throat which required medical attention. At the doctor's office the previous day, Pono met Leilani's older sister for the first time. She worked at the medical center as a nurse. In the conversation Leilani welcomed Pono back to school and they talked about her sister. In this conversation group members shared out-of-school knowledge and learned about each other's families.

January 17 - Before Class Talk

001	Malia:	(Races Kaipo to get binders.)
002	Leilani:	Hi, Ipo! (to Kaipo)
003		(Hugs Pono)
004		Welcome back! (to Pono)
005	Pono:	I saw your sister yesterday.
006		At Straub.
007	Leilani:	It was you!
008		She couldn't remember the name.
009	Pono:	Yeah
010		She looks just like you.
011	Leilani:	Everybody says that!
012		(Laughs)

(Tells group about her sister who is a nurse, seven years older, but looks like Leilani's twin.)

In the next two transcript segments glasses and contact lenses were discussed. Textual data substantiated that because of their history, the group members felt comfortable interacting on a more personal or intimate level at this point in time with questions or directives such as, "What do glasses make you do?" (February 2, line 002), "Let me try em" (February 2, line 005), "Why didn't you?" (March 18, line 124) and "You should wear 'em next year" (March 18, line 126).

February 2 - Before Class Talk

001	Pono:	Kaipo
002		What do glasses make you do?
003	Kaipo:	See better.
004		Clearer
005	Pono:	Let me try 'em.
006	Kaipo:	Oh
007		Uh
008		Okay
009	Pono:	(Tries on glasses) Whoooa!

March 18 - TOPIC #3 - Contact Lenses

121 Kaipo: Are they soft lenses?

122 Are they soft lenses or glass?

(Watches Leilani check over her contact lens)

123 I was gonna wear'em this year but I didn't want to.

124 Malia: Why didn't you?

125 Kaipo: Didn't want to.

126 Malia: Wear 'um next year.

127 Kaipo: I don't know, I might

In the March 19 excerpt, Leilani and Kaipo used sarcastic actions and words as they joked and teased each other. This type of interaction did not occur early on when their relationship was more tentative.

March 19 - Before Class Talk

001 Leilani: (Hits Kaipo with her books.)

002 Get off my seat.

003 What is that

004 on my desk? (Laughs)

005 Kaipo: A dead rose.

006 I thought you were Morticia.

007 [(Laughs)

008 L & K: [(Laugh)

The next segment came from an interview conducted the last week of the school year. Here Malia emphasized that the longevity of the group allowed the students to get to know each other better and then work together. The other group members shared parallel perceptions regarding their face-to-face interactions in their interviews. The implication was that interactions with peers where less history had been established tended to be more superficial.

Malia's Interview

Q. Does it make any difference how long the group has worked together?

A. Yeah. It's better if you're in the group longer, because if you stay in a group only a little while you don't really know the people good, yeah? If you stay in long, then you really get to know your group.

Q. Okay. So what is it like working in this group?

A. I think because we were together so long, we learned how to work with each other after awhile. I think it really helps because you're not -- like if you don't have a really good idea, you only have like one idea, then you join it up with somebody

else's idea. Then comes a really good idea instead of just your idea, like for response logs an' stuff.

To summarize, Leilani, Malia, Kaipo and Pono each stated that initially they were hesitant to interact. They evolved as a group; the longevity of the group had a positive impact on the nature and depth of their interactions and feelings of connectedness. Over time, their face-to-face interactions became more comfortable and 'group' became an accurate descriptor of the manner in which the four participants functioned. As the school year progressed, they spontaneously conversed whenever there were opportunities and extended their relationships beyond the English classroom. The four students worked together for approximately six months, and over that period of time they came to regard each other as good friends.

3. The Salience of Harmony

The significance of harmonious and pleasurable interactions was the third theme that emerged from the students' perceptions of their talk. The general consensus of the participants was that they enjoyed being members of Table #3 because their interactions were congenial, playful, and lighthearted, yet attentive to the language arts curriculum. Some of these feelings were revealed in letters written to incoming seventh graders explaining what it was like to be a student in Mrs. Smith's classroom.

Leilani wrote:

> If you need help, ask your peers on your table! Yup, you sit together in groups. This is so you learn how to get along. My group last year was the best! We had so much fun together. We had our share of ups and downs, but doesn't anybody? Your group helps you with projects, or when you have a hard time of thinking up what to write. We talked about everything! Boys, girls, school, our friends, anything! And when we had trouble, we talked about it with our group.

Leilani's writing substantiated having fun and learning to get along as accomplishments of the group. She also made it clear that their interactions were not always harmonious, but that group members worked together to address problems that arose. In her individual interview Leilani elaborated on the significance of group harmony and avoidance of conflict in this way:

> I don't think anybody in the group likes to be mad at each other -- because then it's not fun, yeah? Because in the group we always have fun and nobody likes when we fight, so usually it's Pono that says -- well, yeah -- you know we're fighting too much right now. And then either me or Kaipo will say, oh okay, and then we'll hug

and then everybody kiss and make up. That's usually how it is.

Non-verbal dynamics also impacted the harmony or disharmony of the peer conversations. Kaipo explained Leilani's ability to affect the group as well as the group's ability to influence Leilani's frame of mind:

> Well, for one thing, everybody knows when she--Leilani comes in mad, she's mad. For some reason --we don't know what reason--when she goes out of the class she's happy and we were trying to find out what it is that we did to make her happy. I don't know. I think mostly Pono makes her happy. Pono is the funniest one at the table. Like Pono and them are like 'ohana, like sisters--sister and brother.

Here Kaipo explained how the relationship between Pono and Leilani positively affected the group with the word *'ohana* which in the Hawaiian culture refers to family, kinship, community or domestic circles. Kaipo's characterization of the peer group as an *'ohana* was significant because the term is commonly used to suggest solidarity (Solomon, 1980). Throughout the study Leilani and Pono were referred to in kinship terms by each other as well as Malia and Kaipo. This 'kinship,' was initiated by Leilani

because she didn't have any brothers and decided to 'adopt' Pono for that role. Leilani often hugged Pono, which signaled a "kiss and make-up" or resolution of disharmony. Although the physical gesture usually involved Leilani and Pono, the action served to mediate group tensions and reaffirm solidarity.

These four Hawaiian seventh grade students strived to maintain harmony by assessing and influencing each others' moods, engaging in conflict resolution when necessary, and referring to members with kinship terms. Disharmony caused extreme discomfort for the group and directly impacted their level of enjoyment. These interactional patterns reflected the Hawaiian values of aloha and 'ohana "directed toward avoiding interpersonal conflict and social disharmony" and preferences for congenial interactions (Gallimore & Howard, 1974, p. 10).

4. Summary of Section B

Findings from the perspective of the students will be summarized in this section. Three types of insights were gleaned from the participants' point of view.

First, the terms "doing English" and "socializing" were used to differentiate two salient categories of face-to-face interactions. According to the students, "doing English" included all talk related to the language arts curriculum. "Socializing" encompassed all non-language arts conversations. Use of these terms for talk indicated student recognition of social and academic agendas. The importance

of the two forms of action to the peer group members was depicted in the back-and-forth pattern they described.

Second, the four individual students became a group over time. The history of the group affected their comfort level when interacting and the nature of their conversations. Talk about other classes, one prominent form of "socializing," served as a 'safe' and common topic of conversation early on in the group formation. As time went on the group members learned more about each other through "socializing" which impacted their engagement in "doing English."

Third, group harmony was maintained by assessing and influencing moods; engaging in conflict resolution; referring to each other in kinship terms. Each of these interactional patterns relate to Hawaiian cultural norms described in the review of the literature.

The concepts summarized represent activities and accomplishments produced, displayed, and labeled by classroom members. The perspective of the students provided the two basic analytic categories of the face-to-face interactions, "doing English" and "socializing" which will be explicated further in the remainder of this dissertation.

C. Features of the Face-to-Face Interactions

In this section salient features of academic and social interactions will be described. These findings are conceptually tied to the two major points that emerged from analysis of the students' perspectives in section B. Using the interpretive theory of Carbaugh (1989), "instances-of-

the-terms-for-talk" will be utilized to present "features-of-the-talk" or prominent characteristics identified in the conversational analysis, data coding, and textual analysis processes. First, features which differentiated "doing English" and "socializing" are discussed. Topic patterns of selected transcripts will be delineated and the data coding sheets examined for evidence of the back-and-forth pattern of "doing English" and "socializing" that the students described as well as the tone or emotional feelings attributed to particular activities. Secondly, analysis of features that influenced group harmony will be discussed, including: "getting busted," arguing and fighting, preserving the status of group members, using humor, and mediating tensions.

1. Differentiating "Doing English" and "Socializing"

Topic analysis and tone of engagement for each of the three videotaped segments selected for micro-analysis is presented in this section. In Transcript #1 the students worked to outline the plot line of a short story the teacher had read aloud in class the previous day. In Transcript #2 the group shared response logs and then engaged in discussion. Transcript #3 depicts a student-directed work period during which students finished assignments listed on the white board: vocabulary poster, book log, or pleasure reading. Each transcript represents a salient form of task-oriented peer group interaction (as elaborated in Chapter III).

a. Topic Analysis of Transcript #1

The assignment during this class was for the members of each table to plot the story line of "You Can't Just Walk On By" from *Elements of Literature*, the English anthology. The short story was introduced as follows in the textbook:

> This short-short piece of Bordon Deal's is a recollection of a terrifying encounter with a huge water moccasin (a poisonous snake). The story is riveting. (Could anyone put it aside once the boy raises his hoe?) The story also lets us share the boy's thoughts about the most profound questions a person can try to answer (Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1989, p. 150).

Each student had drawn a plot line on binder paper on which he or she wrote the rising actions, climax, and falling actions. The teacher's directions were:

> First, find the climax, where the tension is highest, and the very next thing -- phew he's safe! Then decide the other points along the way... (Referred to rising and falling actions).

Figure 4.3 lists the topics of the conversation and included message units designated by transcript line numbers.

Topic Pattern

March 3 - Transcript #1

Topics	Line #s
1. Plot Line	1 - 259
2. Timing	260-265
3. Plot Line	266-297
4. Disagreement	298-306
5. Plot Line	307-353
6. Disagreement	354-367
7. Plot Line	368-414
8. Format of Paper	415-419
9. Plot Line	420-442
10. Disagreement	443-446
11. Pono's Dropped Pencil	447-451
12. Other Classes	452-459
13. Time Limit	460-473
14. Plot Line	474-547
15. Timing	548-551
16. Plot Line	552-645
17. Counting Action Points	646-653
18. Doing Own Thing	654-676
19. Counting Points	677-730

Figure 4.3: Topic Pattern March 3, Transcript #1

There were 19 topic units delineated on Transcript #1. Seven of the topic units were labeled "Plot Line", with two additional segments for counting the number of action points in order to share their group totals with the whole class. Three topic units dealt with "Timing"; one unit concerned the "Format" of the paper; and one was titled "Doing Own Thing" because Kaipo had withdrawn from the group. Three of topic units were labeled "Disagreement," as the participants could not agree on the story element to be included on the plot line. The remaining two topic units, "Pono's Dropped Pencil" and "Other Classes," served to mediate the heightened tensions after the third recurrence of "Disagreement." The basic topic pattern included Plot Line - Disagreement - Plot Line - Disagreement - Plot Line - Disagreement. Each segment of Disagreement started and ended with a message unit connoting silence among the group members. The predominant content coded on the Data Coding Sheets for the topic units of this transcript was "doing English." Only message units for topics #11 and #12, "Pono's Dropped Pencil" and "Other Classes," were coded "socializing."

In Transcript #1, the content of the peer group talk followed the pattern identified by the students, but to a very limited degree, "doing English - socializing - doing English," with no further repetition of the pattern. Of the total 730 message units, 717 were indexed "doing English" and 13 were indexed "socializing."

b. Topic Analysis of Transcript #2

In Transcript #2, Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono shared written response logs. The day before, Mrs. Smith had read "After Twenty Years" aloud to the class while the students followed along in their English anthology. The textbook introduction follows:

> A lot can happen in twenty years. When two friends meet after twenty years have gone by, you expect to see some changes. Still, you may not expect all the changes that the two friends in this story experience. Pause after paragraph 6, after the face of the man in the doorway is revealed. From the description of his appearance, try to guess what the man is like. Then read on to see if you are correct. What surprises might this famous O. Henry story hold in store for you? (Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1989, p. 194)

After the reading, Mrs. Smith asked the students to write what they would have done as Jimmy Wells, the main character, and to explain why. There were ten minutes of quiet writing time after which the teacher gave these directions: "You all have some position? Okay, will you read your positions around the group, however many of these you have."

Figure 4.4 lists the topics of conversation and included message units designated by transcript line numbers.

Topic Pattern

March 11 - Transcript #2

Topics	Line #s
Sharing Positions	001-040
New Scenario	041-063
Queen Elizabeth	064-077
New Scenario (Different Angle)	078-134

Figure 4.4: Topic Pattern March 11, Transcript #2

Transcript #2 was divided into four topic units. All of the 40 message units of the first topic, "Sharing Positions," were coded "doing English" as the students took turns reading descriptions of what they would have done in the main character's position and then explaining why. The 24 message units of the second topic, "New Scenario," were also coded "doing English." The conversation and argument were related to the 'what-if' scenarios involving group members in story character roles. The disagreement ended as Leilani threw her pencil at Kaipo and laughed (line 064). The third topic, "Queen Elizabeth" was initiated with Kaipo's response to Leilani (line 065) in which he called her "Queen Elizabeth." The 13 messages of topic #3 were coded "socializing." This topic unit served to mediate the disagreement that had occurred during topic #2, New Scenario. Then, once group rapport was reestablished in line 078, Kaipo again directed the conversation back to the "what-if" discussion from a different angle. The 31 message units of topic #4 were coded "doing English" because the discussion related to the assignment.

Of the 134 total message units in this transcript, 13 were coded "socializing" and 121 were coded "doing English." The content pattern of Transcript #2 was "doing English - socializing - doing English." Similar to Transcript #1, there was no repetition of the pattern and the majority of message units were indexed "doing English." Another

similarity was that the "socializing" originated at a time of disagreement among the group members.

c. Topic Analysis of Transcript #3

The March 18 class period, covered in Transcript #3, was a student-directed class. During the "catch-up work period" students decided for themselves which of the activities listed on the whiteboard they would complete during the 45-minute period. According to the teacher's directions, they were to complete vocabulary posters, reading records, or engage in pleasure reading, in that order of priority. Leilani had been absent on the three previous days. Spring vacation was a day and a half away which may also have contributed to the high level of excitement and playfulness of the students during the interaction.

Figure 4.5 lists the topics of conversation and included message units designated by transcript line numbers.

Topic Pattern

March 18 **Transcript #3**

Topics	Line #s
1. Other Class - Math	1-100
2. Posters	101-117
3. Contact Lenses	118-143
4. Pencils	144-156
5. Posters	157-184
6. MTV	185-187
7. Eraser	188-202
8. Clothes	203-206
9. Materials	207-214
10. Posters	215-291
11. Pono's Girlfriend	292-301
12. Materials	302-308
13. Pono's Girlfriend	309-322
14. Kinship	323-327
15. Assignment	328-365
16. Activities	366-374
17. Classmates	375-397
18. Assignment	398-404
19. Fooling Around	405-452
20. Assignment	453-464
21. Activities	465-477
22. Assignment	478-485
23. Fooling around	486-505
24. Assignment	506-519
25. Fooling around	520-543
26. Activity	544-565
27. Fooling Around	566-655
28. Assignment	656-680

Figure 4.5: Topic Pattern March 18, Transcript #3

Of the 28 topics delineated in the March 18 transcript, the 12 predominantly indexed as "doing English" were labeled "Posters," "Assignment," and "Materials." Topic #12, "Vocabulary Poster," included message units indexed "socializing," "doing English," and eight message units coded as both, when Leilani and Kaipo engaged in a playful argument using their vocabulary words. The remaining 14 topics were predominantly indexed as "socializing" and included: "Other Class - Math," "Contact Lenses," "Pencils," "MTV," " Eraser," "Clothes," "Pono' s Girlfriend" (two times), "Kinship," "Activities" (two times), "Classmates," and "Fooling Around" (three times). The length of the topic units was variable. The longest topic, #1 "Other Class - Math" included 100 message units; topic #10, "Posters" included 76 message units. The shortest topic was #6, "MTV," which contained only three message units. The median range of the remaining topic units was 15-25 message units.

The peer group talk proceeded back and forth between predominantly social and predominantly academic talk 21 times during the 28 topics of conversation. Of the total 680 message units, 202 were coded as "doing English," 457 as "socializing," and 21 were indexed in both categories. This class certainly seemed affected by the phenomenon known to students and teachers as 'vacation syndrome.' Also, analysis of the message units did not portray "doing English" as accurately as was the case in Transcripts #1 and #2 because

throughout the transcript the students worked on their vocabulary posters while they were "socializing."

The student-directed class represented in Transcript #3 most closely followed the back-and-forth pattern previously described by the students. Interestingly, the transcript also depicted the interactional pattern I found least often across the data. This discrepancy between the students' perception of their talk and my findings prompted further examination of the textual analysis and examination of the literature. As a result, I concluded that the student pattern most closely paralleled out-of-school adolescent peer group communication in the studies of Goodwin (1978, 1990, 1993), Eder (1993), Boggs (1985), Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordon (1974) where word play, teasing, and light-hearted exchanges were the norm. My findings of more academic engagement across the data, on the other hand, were aligned with the educational literature reviewed in Chapter II. Thus, Transcript #3 could be interpreted as more closely depicting the forms of activity engagement Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono enjoyed and preferred rather than an actual norm of interaction in the classroom.

d. Tone of Engagement Across Transcripts

The selected transcripts also revealed differences in the tone of activity engagement. Tone refers to the emotional pitch, feeling, or key of the conversation. The dimension *more serious/more playful* (Carbaugh, 1989) was useful in examining the peer group talk of Leilani, Malia,

Kaipo, and Pono. In the data, "doing English" was generally more serious in tone than "socializing." When the group was "socializing," their interactions were more playful, with laughing and joking around. However, there were times when "doing English" was playful and "socializing" was serious. Topic #1, Other Class - Math, of Transcript #3 provides one illustration of a "socializing" topic in which the tone was serious. In that topic unit, Pono asked Kaipo for assistance with his math assignment. Of the 100 message units, only three included "using humor;" at those times Leilani and Malia were engaged in a separate conversation where they jokingly ridiculed Pono and Kaipo's serious endeavor to solve the math problem. Conversely, there was evidence of less serious interactional tone while "doing English" in the March 18 transcript. The class, which was a student-directed work period, provided a less structured or directive context. Thus, the academic and social agendas of the group were at times happening simultaneously, such as when students conversed about social topics while drawing or constructing their vocabulary posters.

The overall tone of the March 18 transcript was more playful. The March 3 and 11 transcripts were more serious; the tone of these two excerpts was more typical of the ways in which Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono participated in academic tasks. Differences in tone were connected to task involvement. In the more playful transcript, the student-

directed class was less structured than those of March 11 and 18. A list of tasks-to-be-completed had been provided by the teacher, but the students were given the freedom of selecting their activity involvement. The agenda for March 18 also allowed for simultaneous participation in "socializing" and "doing English." In contrast, on March 11 and 18, the peer group was directed toward the completion of a specific language arts agenda within a limited time frame.

To summarize, the structure of the activities influenced the tone of the interactions. Student-directed events were found to be more playful, whereas teacher-directed activities tended to be more serious. This was most evident in the frequency counts on the Data Coding Sheets where "using humor" was coded proportionally more often as "socializing" across the data.

2. Maintaining Group Harmony

In this section, features that show how group harmony was maintained will be explored. First, I examined the transcripts and textual data for factors that promoted or impeded collective group agreement while "doing English" and "socializing" with the general query: What were the underlying factors attributed to harmony or disharmony in each context?

In the March 3 transcript, a high degree of collaboration was required to engage in "doing English" as defined by the teacher. The students were all supposed to have the same plot lines drawn and written on each of their

separate papers. One representative random sample would then be collected and graded. This activity did not allow for the opportunity to "agree to disagree" or "let'm go" that was frequently a norm of interaction. In the textual analysis two issues were found to have affected group harmony in the construction of the short story plot line.

The first issue related to the nature of the lesson. The elements of a short story had been introduced to the class by the teacher in an earlier lesson, but this was the first activity that required comprehension and application of that knowledge. Therefore, the group members did not all clearly understand the concepts of summarizing, rising actions, or climax at that point in time. The result was disagreement regarding the number of climaxes to be included and the type of information needed to denote rising actions. Frustrations with the assignment led to numerous instances of tension as group members proposed and discussed components of their plot line.

The second issue that produced disharmony on the plot line construction was Leilani's mood. Because she wasn't feeling well, Leilani and was extremely short-tempered and snappish. She angrily reacted to Pono's contributions in a manner of disgust, as if each of his ideas were irritating and not of any value to the group. Her put-downs, directed at Pono, and refusal to discuss the perspectives of others resulted in intervals of awkward silence. In the interview data that follows Malia described Leilani's temperament:

Malia's Interview

(Q = my questions; A = Malia's responses)

Q: So how does that happen? How do you know when you shouldn't be socializing?

A: Oh, yeah, because sometimes knowing we have to write down what we think or something, then Leilani's writing and then we start giving her ideas; and sometimes Kaipo and Pono, when they start talking, Leilani and I might get mad at them and then we start yelling at them, to tell them to help us, yeah? And then they'll stop because Leilani will get mad.

Q: And how will they help you?

A: Give some ideas or something.

Q: Okay. So what would happen if she (Leilani) got mad?

A: I don't know, they would get scared, I think.

Q: Oh, okay. Why would that be?

A: Sometimes she gets mad and she starts yelling and gets really mad. You don't want to be by her.

This interview data, collected in May, was useful in understanding how Leilani's attitude affected the group during their class in March. In fact, Malia's last statement in the above segment corresponds quite accurately to the

sequence of events that unfolded in the plot line activity: Leilani was mad, yelling, and the other group members did not want to be near her. The students did not have the liberty of physically leaving the context at that point, but their silence was a form of withdrawal from the interaction.

Although the group was able to bring closure to the plot line task within the allotted time limit, it was the least harmonious and perhaps most painful interaction recorded in the data. These feelings were tacitly evoked when students responded to questions about the event with silence or a change of subject at a lunch meeting the next day.

In the second transcript on March 11, Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono shared written response logs by taking turns reading them aloud as the teacher had directed. The purpose of this "doing English" activity was to prepare for a class discussion of various points of view. The task was comparable to the first transcript in that various opinions were called for and expected.

Malia read her response first, indicating that she agreed with the main character in the story and would not have arrested her friend. Pono then shared that he would have called the police, just like Jimmy Wells in the story. Next, Kaipo interjected that he would have arrested Bobby because it would have been his responsibility to do so as a police officer. Kaipo concluded by expressing shock that the person who had been his best friend could become a criminal. Leilani took her turn last, like Malia and Pono, she would

have called in another police officer to arrest her best friend, just as Jimmy Wells had done. Leilani concluded with the same question as Kaipo, "How could her best friend do such a thing-- become a criminal?"

Kaipo was the only group member who stated that he would have arrested his friend if put in the position of the main character of the short story. Malia, Leilani, and Pono agreed that the character should be apprehended, but they would not have made the arrest themselves. Friendship and loyalty were the similarities of the written responses to the story, but there was no discussion of the different positions taken with respect to the main character. In this lesson each group member shared their written response log as instructed by the teacher. No collective agreement or consensus of opinion regarding the written logs had been required nor was facilitated by the students.

After completion of the teacher's agenda, Kaipo attempted to initiate a follow-up discussion of 'what-if' scenarios. However, Kaipo met with strong resistance from Leilani and Pono when he proposed different hypothetical situations related to the written text in which group members were portrayed negatively. Substituting group members in the role of the criminal in the story resulted in disharmony which effectively curtailed the conversation. Leilani, Malia, and Pono refused to engage in speculative conjecture that involved negative connotations of their peers. The issue of discord appeared to be the status of group members.

The March 18 class was more loosely structured than those represented in the other two transcripts. During this student-directed work period, students were to finish various 'in-progress' assignments. For the most part, collective agreement was related to decisions regarding "doing English" or "socializing." It was significant that instances of disharmony emerged because the student-directed and more playful nature of the transcript, compared to the previous two, might cause one to surmise that the event was entirely harmonious.

The first instantiation of a breakdown in group agreement stemmed from Pono's request for assistance with a math problem, a "socializing" topic. The resultant interchange involved other group members solving the problem and telling Pono the answer which made him angry. Here again, status of a group member was the issue of disagreement.

Later in the transcript, a lack of group consensus was evident in their physical separation. Pono had moved away from Leilani, Malia, and Kaipo who were "socializing." Apart from the others, Pono engaged in "doing English."

To summarize, in each of the three transcripts selected for micro-analysis the knowledge students were required to agree upon varied. The maintenance of group harmony related to the nature of the task, mood of participants, and "getting busted" by the teacher. Across the three transcripts, status of a group member was a commonality of disharmony. Comparing

and contrasting of general patterns across the data contributed to a better understanding of which underlying factors influenced group engagement. The salient findings identified here will be further explicated in each of the following subsections. At times the activities of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono conflicted with expectations within the larger classroom context, which will be discussed in the section on "getting busted." At other times tensions arose within the parameters of the peer group. These instances were organized into the categories of arguing and fighting, preserving the status of group members, using humor, and mediating tensions.

a. "Getting Busted"

In the classroom context, inappropriate behavior, at times, resulted in a verbal reprimand or other negative sanction from Mrs. Smith. These interactions were referred to by both the teacher and students as "getting busted." Actions that resulted in "getting busted" included not doing homework, not listening to teacher directions, or not having the necessary materials when the bell rang. The most common infraction, however, was excessive or boisterous "socializing" when "doing English" was necessary for the task at hand. In an interview, Leilani explained that there were fewer instantiations of "getting busted" over the course of the school year as the students adjusted to the expectations of their teacher and Mrs. Smith acknowledged the idiosyncrasies of her students:

Like as the year went on she (Mrs. Smith) got kinda--loose--yeah cuz she got to know us more. Like me--she's knows that I'm loud and everything--yeah--just boisterous kine. She always excuses--not always, but like--see, as a girl, I know when to say stuff. Like I don't want to say something when she's talking because then I'll know she'll get mad. But like Miki (at next table) starts to say something and the teacher's talking, I say sh-h-h-h because I don't want him or anybody on our table to get scoldings. I don't know, I'm afraid of getting embarrassed. She'd be like what are you talking about? And she'd start, not exactly yelling, but if she's in a crabby mood she might have a hissy fit. And then, you know it's because of you that she's having that fit. And so you get embarrassed and 'shame because this is what you've done, created.

If students were off-task or "socializing," they could "get busted" and lose COP points (as explained in Chapter III, stands for Cooperation, Organization, and Participation) which were recorded daily and factored into report card grades. Since each of the four participants expressed the desire to earn good grades, they tried to avoid this consequence by directing each other's activities when necessary. "Someone says okay, let's get back to the subject or Mrs. Smith is gonna get mad. Then we remember we're in English and get back on track," explained Leilani.

In the next segment of transcript the group was "getting busted" because of too much fooling around:

March 18 - Topic #19 - Fooling Around

419 Leilani: Help me!

420 All: (Laugh)

421 Leilani: I can't breathe.

422 Kaipo: Then die!

423 (All laugh, then Leilani grabs Malia's pen again)

424 Leilani: Malia

425 Malia, I'll sing a song

426 (Sings) Don't walk away from me.

427 Don't walk away from me.

428 All: (Laugh)

429 Pono: Yeah that's mean boys

430 All: (Laugh)

431 Leilani: Look try go like this.

432 Put your hand like this

433 (Holds her arm winglike).

434 Goes like this

435 try ta bite your ear

436 Kaipo: Try to play ((Inaudible))

437 All: (Laugh)

438 Leilani: Because she's so mental.

439 All: (Laugh)

440 Malia: Don't cry now!

441 Leilani: (Mimics someone crying as all laugh)

442 Pono: (Tries to write, then makes exaggerated sobs)

443 Kaipo: (To Pono) Don't die.

444 Malia: (To teacher off screen) That's them (Pointing at others)

445 Teacher: (Off screen) If you wouldn't mind.

446 Leilani: Where's my pencil?

447 Oh, I threw it in the bag.

448 Kaipo: ((Inaudible))

449 Looks like you're acting like Ali'i for one day.

450 Leilani: What?

451 Kaipo: You always act like Ali'i.

452 Leilani: (Makes a face)

Once the noise level and conversation of the Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono infringed on the ability of other students in the class to engage in "doing English," Mrs. Smith reprimanded the group (line 445), "If you wouldn't mind." This was a mild rebuke and probably would not result in the loss of COP points if the group redirected their activity.

The following segment of transcript was recorded later in the same class, after the incident of "getting busted" discussed above. Here, Pono physically removed himself from the group and attempted to write his reading log. Kaipo,

Malia, and Leilani remained in their regular seats "socializing" and working on vocabulary posters. After getting up to attend to a matter away from the table, Kaipo returned and responded to Pono's absence:

March 18 - Topic # 28 - Assignment

657 Malia: Oh man.
658 I can't find any pictures of snobby people.
659 Kaipo: (Returns) Don't bother me I have to read.
(To Pono off camera)
660 Pono, why are you still back there?
661 Pono: Cuz I don't wanna
662 I don't wanna get busted.
663 Leilani: (Gets up, goes to Pono.)
664 Kaipo: I feel rejected at this table.
665 (Pushes his chair away from table, off camera)
666 Leilani: (Stands near Pono) Come Pono
667 Pono: All right.
668 [You promise you won't be noisy?
669 Leilani: [Promise, sorry
670 Pono: [Okay
671 I forgive you (Pono & Leilani move back to table with Malia).
672 Leilani: So why is 'Ipo over there now?

673 Here Malia, listen to this paragraph.

674 (She puts her head on the desk, not reading)

675 (The teacher comes over, stands next to Malia. An unidentified boy sits in a chair next to Kaipo's place. Mrs. Smith and Malia talk in inaudible voices.)

Pono's move away from the group and his response to questions regarding his withdrawal from the group indicated that he believed Malia and Kaipo were going to "get busted" again and that a second violation in one class would result in more severe consequences. The move implied that Pono did not agree with the activity choice of his peers and chose not to participate in the interaction. The loud and boisterous style of their activity deterred Pono from attempting to redirect the group toward their assignments verbally, an action he had at other times used effectively to redirect the actions of group members. Instead, Pono's physical separation more effectively expressed his decision to engage in "doing English" rather than risk "getting busted" again. Pono's non-verbal stance effectively functioned to disrupt and redirect the activities of the other group members. This was first indicated when Kaipo realized that Pono was working near the bookcase area in line 643, "Why are you still back there?" At that point, Pono was in a position to verbally

express his concerns regarding the impending consequences if the group did not redirect their activities.

Pono continued by stating his reason for withdrawing from the group (line 645), "I don't wanna get busted." His announcement not to be affiliated with the group for fear of being negatively sanctioned by the teacher indicated that the other group members were infringing on his right to engage in "doing English." Leilani's move to make amends signaled her realization that Pono's rights as a group member had been violated and her desire to atone for the lapse in judgment of the group. The fact that Pono required assurance, "You promise you won't be noisy? (line 668), indicated that he was not totally convinced of the sincerity of her apology. Pono maintained that he would only rejoin the group if he was able to get his work done. His statement, "Okay, I forgive you," (lines 670-671) affirmed Pono's decision to reenter the peer group network. It was at that point that Leilani realized Kaipo had opted for a more autonomous stance, (line 653) and asked, "Now what's 'Ipo doin' over there?" Here the structure of the group disintegrated when opinions of the group members regarding activity choice were at odds.

The excerpts from the data presented above illustrate that one student would scold another if the group was in jeopardy of being reprimanded by the teacher. "Socializing" was also monitored because not being engaged in "doing English" for an extended period of time, or being more loud and rambunctious than other class members, could result in

"getting busted" by the teacher. A salient accomplishment of the peer group talk was to avoid "getting busted." Group members monitored each other in order to influence and redirect inappropriate activities. In that way the governing of choices within the group was a microcosm of the larger classroom power structure. The peer group members "busted" each other to prevent "getting busted" by Mrs. Smith. In so doing, Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono, at times, functioned in authoritative roles congruent with those of the teacher in the larger classroom context. These preventative actions were utilized to present a positive group status to the teacher and whole class.

b. Arguing and Fighting

In the data, the students distinguished between acceptable even valued conflict and unacceptable conflict in their utilization of the terms "arguing" and "fighting." The meanings of arguing and fighting in the selected transcripts and interview data will be recounted in this section.

In his interview, Pono explained *arguing* as the presentation of differing opinions, followed by negotiation of a decision.

<u>Pono's Interview</u>

Q. Do you *argue*?

A. Yeah.

Q. Uh-huh, can you give me an example?

A. Well, if someone had an opinion on something, and another person had an opinion, they' ll *argue* about and say that we could do this or we could do that and after a while decide, because you have to decide it.

On March 3, the word *arguing* was used by the participants at several different times, the first of which comes at the end of the next excerpt (line 299):

March 3 - TOPIC #3 - Plot Line

266 Leilani: But
267 [but we skipped some things.
268 Kaipo: [So go like this.
269 You know like
270 right here
271 Leilani: How come you guys
272 came from the heel to the hoe part?
273 Kaipo: [No put
274 Pono: [We're going backwards
275 Kaipo: No
276 Put the heel
277 Put the heel
278 on the second part.
279 Leilani: [But

280 Kaipo: [No

281 put the heel,

282 put the heel on the second point.

283 Malia: The heel is after

284 when he's holding the hoe.

285 Kaipo: [He's holding the hoe and

286 Leilani: [No-o-o-o

287 Kaipo: He chops it in half,

288 but only

289 [the head is behind him

290 Leilani: [The heel

291 Pono: [No, look

292 The bottom down.

293 The bottom is relief.

294 Malia: Yeah

295 He' s thinking he got away.

296 And then he goes up again.

297 And then he's right by the heel.

March 3 - TOPIC #4 - Disagreement

298 (All get very quiet)

299 Kaipo: (to Leilani) *Argue*

300 Tell us what you want.

Kaipo attempted to relieve the tension signaled in line 298 by encouraging Leilani to *argue* her point of view and the tell the group what she wanted (lines 299-300). Later in the

same transcript Pono attempted to engage the group in *arguing* so that they could reach consensus on the plot line construction:

363 Pono: We gotta *argue* it out an'
364 An' have the same thing.
365 So when she collects it,
366 we all have the same thing.

In the next segment a negative connotation of *arguing* was presented. The extreme degree of *"too much"* disagreement, at that point in time, immobilized the activity of the group:

March 3 - TOPIC #10 - Disagreement

443 Leilani: (LOUD sigh)
444 All: (Get very QUIET)
445 Pono: O-o-oh
446 We *argue* too much!

The final occurrence of *arguing* in the March 3 transcript is presented next. The meaning implied in Leilani's word choice was that a discussion was taking place. Thus, usage of the word *arguing* was positive. However, Leilani's tone and antagonistic delivery of that message to Pono was extreme, and could be interpreted to relate to the negative example of *"too much"* mentioned above.

497 Pono: B.D.

498 B.D. hesitated.

499 Leilani: We're *arguing*.

500 Pono: All right.

501 It says it,

502 [right here...

503 Leilani: [That's before!

504 We're over here now,

505 we're finished doing the climax!

Arguing, for this peer group, was generally depicted as a necessary and effective conversational form used to express differences of opinion. Group members were encouraged, by the teacher and each other, to engage in such interactions. However, *arguing too much* was not purposeful because the extreme degree of disharmony served to annihilate rather than facilitate discussion.

In the next transcript segment the teacher's perspective of the term *fighting* was revealed (in line 092):

March 11 - TOPIC #3 - New Scenario

078 Kaipo: Pono (pointing at him)

079 No

080 Put it this way.

081 There's nobody around

082 Absolutely nobody around you

083 Right?

084		Twenty years from now.
085		We know Kapua's the murderer
086		We arrest her
087		Cuz there's nobody there to do the job.
088	Pono:	((Inaudible))
089	Leilani:	[I didn't murder anybody!
090	Kaipo:	[I said
091		Keku was a murderer.
092	Teacher:	Are we *fighting* here children?
093	Leilani:	No
094		He's just taking it from a different angle
095	Teacher:	That's okay.
096	Leilani:	[I know but...
097	Kaipo:	[But she misunderstood me
098		She thought I said HER.
099	Leilani:	I thought he said
100		if you had murdered somebody
101		would you arrest her?
102		I said
103		I'm not going to be a murderer!
104	Kaipo:	But I didn't say her name.
105	Leilani:	(Sarcastic) My mistake (Laughs)
106		I'm sorry (Laughs)
107	Kaipo:	(Sarcastic) You better be.
108		(Laughs)

Here Kaipo broached the "what-if" discussion by using the name of a classmate who was not a member of their group. However, Leilani had not heard him correctly and assumed that Kaipo was referring to her as a hypothetical murderer. As Leilani and Kaipo expressed their differences of opinion in a loud verbal exchange, the teacher walked by their table and commented, "Are we *fighting* here, children?" Mrs. Smith's comment was spoken in a humorous tone, as if to mitigate the situation, but implied that *fighting* was an activity for children, whereas discussion and debate were appropriate interactional strategies for the young adults in this classroom.

The student perspective of *fighting* as affecting group harmony (fuller excerpt of interview on p. 94) was presented earlier:

> ... nobody likes when we *fight*, so usually it's Pono that says --well, yeah --you know we're *fighting too much* right now. And then either me or Kaipo will say, oh okay, and then we'll hug and then everybody kiss and make up.

Here it seemed that *fighting too much* was perceived as inappropriate, an activity viewed negatively by the group and teacher. In her interview, however, Leilani made reference to a positive form of fighting which she called a *play-fight*:

Leilani's Interview

When we have a *play-fight* kind of thing and mainly Kaipo -- it's usually me and Kaipo that are *fighting*. He would say something like -- when we were doing our vocabulary words, yeah? He would use a word in a sentence, and I would say -- and I was talking to him and I was using the words -- and I said -- and I ended it off with, "You have some temerity!"

To summarize, *arguing* was found to be an appropriate venue of interaction, required and accepted for discussing differences of opinion within the structure of the language arts classroom. The exception was *arguing too much* which served to silence peer group members rather than enhance participation and was synonymous with *fighting*. For the most part, *fighting* was deemed non-productive, and even immature by the teacher -- an activity for children not appropriate in a seventh grade classroom. However, a *play-fight* was an acceptable humorous exchange and therefore an appropriate mode of discourse. These concepts relate to the Hawaiian cultural norms of the exhibition of silence in response to confrontation or discomfort, avoidance of conflict, and promotion of harmonious interactions.

c. Preserving the Status of Group Members

An egalitarian notion of status was promoted in the interactional patterns of this Hawaiian peer group. By that,

I mean that it was not appropriate for group members to claim a status above their peers, nor should they feel compelled to put themselves down, below their peers. Equal footing of all members was an implicit norm maintained by the group. The exceptions to this rule were humorous exchanges where the status of an individual was raised or lowered in a joking manner. Breaches of status will be explored in this section.

In the following transcript an assumption of status was refuted in a humorous exchange between Leilani and Malia:

January 6 - Transcript

Topic: Sharing interpretations of poems

054 L & M: (Both attempt to talk first)

055 Leilani: I was gonna go first!

056 Malia: Okay teacher!

057 Leilani: (Tells her impression of poem)

The use of humor allowed Malia to acknowledge that Leilani had claimed a higher position of importance and put her back in her place without causing a disagreement.

In the following conversation, Kaipo proclaimed his self-importance in his implicit claim to be an indispensable member of the group:

December 15 - Transcript - Before Class Talk

008 Kaipo: You' re gonna miss me when I' m gone.
[(Laughs)

009 Pono: [(Laughs) Yee--a-ah

010 Sure!

011 Like we' re not gonna come to school

012 Or somethin'

013 [Cuz you' re not here! (laughs)

014 Leilani: [Yeah, Ipo! (laughs)

015 Malia: [Sure Kaipo!

016 All: (Laugh)

In this exchange, Kaipo appeared to be seeking an opening to tell the group about his up-coming vacation to Disney Land. His technique, however, was not effective. The claim of higher status did, indeed, open up a dialogue, but the purpose was to lower Kaipo' s status, back down on a par with his peers. Pono, Leilani, and Malia, in turn, insinuated that Kaipo' s claim was preposterous. The laughter of the group members during and after the exchange served to bring closure to the issue with no apparent residual tension.

Put-downs of oneself were also responded to by group members as can be seen in the next scenario:

April 22 - Field Notes

Topic: Vocabulary Contest Results

Group members return to home tables after each competed against another group. Talked about numbers of points each had scored:

Leilani	22
Malia	28
Kaipo	38
Pono	8

Pono: I only got eight.

Others: That's okay

All: Clap, cheer, hug as teacher announces their group is the winner.

In this case, the group focused on the number of points they had earned in the recently completed vocabulary contest. Pono expressed feelings of inadequacy and letting his peers down with his low score. The other group members verbally and physically reassured Pono that his score had not upset them when they included Pono in the celebration of the groups' collective triumph in the class contest. Their considerable margin of victory revealed that Pono's score was not an issue of contention.

The next segment was taken from the beginning of class on March 18 when the status of a group member was not respected:

March 18 - Topic #1 - Other Class: Math

049 Leilani: What the hell are you guys doin?

(To Kaipo & Pono as they get very loud)

050 Kaipo: Twelve.

051 Malia: They' re tryin ta count.

052 Pono: This is twelve.

053 Kaipo: Nine, nineteen, twelve.

054 Leilani: (To Malia) You wanna count too? (Laugh)

055 Pono: That's not twelve.

056 Malia: No wait,

057 they're trying ta do it by themselves.

058 M & L: (Laugh)

059 Kaipo: Twelve, nineteen,

060 Twelve, nineteen,

061 Quiet (to M & L)

062 M & L: (Laugh)

063 Kaipo: Twenty-six

064 Twenty-nine

065 No that's not

066 Oh

067 Nine

068 Pono: Oh

069 Come on, come on.

070 Kaipo: One two three four five six seven

071 Wait

072 Now I'm

073 Now I know.

074	Pono:	Okay now thirteen plus,
075		No wait!
076		I want to do it by myself!
077	Kaipo:	(Reaching for calculator) Alright already
078	Pono:	Wait.
079		22 + 28 = 40 Right?
080		40 + 40 that's 80
081		That's 80
082	Malia:	(Leans over to look at Pono's paper)
083	Pono:	That's 80
084		Wait wait wait wait wait
085		That's 22
086		22 right there
087	Kaipo:	I was right it's ninety!
088	Malia:	It's ninety
089	Pono:	Oh
090	Malia:	Oo-o-ah
091		(Sighs & sits back down)
092	Kaipo:	I WAS right!
093	Pono:	Don't TELL me !
094		Okay?
095	Leilani:	'Ipo
096		You-u-u guys
097		Po-o-ono
098	Pono:	Oh
099		Hug
100	P & L	(Embrace)

While Pono and Kaipo collaborated to solve the math problem, Leilani and Malia worked on their vocabulary posters and talked between themselves. Two conversations unfolded simultaneously until (line 49) when Leilani asked, "What the hell are you doing?" as the boys' voices grew louder. Her question was ignored as Pono and Kaipo continued solving the problem. In line 73 Kaipo announced that he knew the answer, but Pono (line 75) directed him to "wait", not to tell the answer because Pono claimed, "I want to do it by myself" (line 76). Here Malia joined in the math problem solving. She and Kaipo (lines 87 & 88) confirmed that they indeed had calculated the correct answer. Kaipo went on (line 92) to announce and claim, "I WAS right!" Pono pulled away, demonstrating his frustration regarding his diminished status. Pono loudly and angrily requested, "Don't TELL me, okay?" At that point, the activity became the concern of the four-person group as both Malia and Leilani were drawn into the problem solving of the math equation as well as the tension between Pono and Kaipo.

Although Pono appreciated being helped, he steadfastly refused to have the problem solved for him. Pono's status as a student was lowered when he was not given the opportunity "to do it by myself." Malia's involvement in solving the problem with Kaipo ahead of Pono compounded his exasperation. In effect, Kaipo and Malia had dismissed Pono from the interaction as they engaged in oneupmanship. Their activity robbed Pono of the opportunity to solve the problem. His

needs were then secondary to the competition between Malia and Kaipo. Once Pono raised his voice in frustration, Leilani mediated: first, she chided Kaipo with the playful shortened version of his name "' Ipo" (line 95); next, scolded Pono for his involvement in the disagreement (line 97); then smoothed things over with a hug (line 100) which served to dissolve the discrepancies of member status.

Another interaction involving status was noted in the March 11 transcript. That case involved Kaipo lowering the status of group members in what-if scenarios. Even though Kaipo's narratives were hypothetical, the substitution of group members for characters that were criminals was not taken lightly. Leilani and Pono were indignant and adamantly objected to being depicted in a negative light, as criminals. For that reason, engagement in speculation, as proposed by Kaipo, was not a possibility. The subject was too close to home for the group members.

To summarize, the preservation of group member status involved non-tolerance of put-downs or statements of self importance, except when enacted with humor. The implicit goal was an egalitarian positioning of peer group members, a prominent Hawaiian cultural norm.

d. Using Humor

Using humor provided a playful approach to dealing with conflict within the peer group and was a common characteristic of their interactions. As stated earlier, one form of humor, a "play fight" consisted of verbal sparring,

where humor was used to present one's opinion without causing alienation within the group. Kaipo and Leilani, the two most verbal and opinionated members of the group were usually involved. Leilani explained this way:

> Kaipo, he always wanted to be the know-it-all. He always wanted to contribute everything. He had to be the one that was contributing to that. And -- I don't know. Malia, she's quiet. Only when like something really makes her laugh and then she'll think of -- like if our -- like when we have like a play-fight kind of thing ... And Malia starts laughing and then she starts going on and on and talking and talking and talking.

Humor was also used to present a different point of view in a non-adversarial manner. In the next segment from the March 18 transcript, Leilani defended Pono's right to choose his activity involvement:

March 18 Transcript

333 Kaipo: Do your reading record.

334 Malia: Did you do your reading record?

335 Pono: No.

336 Malia: Well, do you reading record.

337 Leilani: But he doesn't want to.

338 Pono: Yeah!

339	Leilani	I can tell everything.
		(Patting Pono on the back as he gets up to get binder)
340		I can read his mind.
341		We're twins can't you see?
342		We're born under the same moon.
343	Malia:	So was everybody else.
344		[(Laughs)
345		[So what?
346	All:	[(Laugh)
347	Kaipo:	You guys are lumps (Laughs).

Leilani suggested that Pono may not have wanted to follow the directives of the teacher, Kaipo, or Malia (line 337), "But he (Pono) doesn't want to do that now." She demonstrated solidarity with Pono and advocated for his individual autonomy. At that point in time, Pono appeared to be in a quandary; his verbal response was not in concert with his physical actions. On the one hand, he was in agreement with Leilani, affirmed with his "Yeah!" (line 338) indicating that he didn't want to work on the reading assignment. Simultaneously, his actions signaled acknowledgement of the directives given by Kaipo and Malia, as was evident when Pono walked over to the bookcase to get his English notebook and reading record. It seemed that Pono agreed with Leilani's sentiments but was going to comply with the directives of Malia and Kaipo and write a reading record. Leilani

continued advocating for Pono as she humorously shifted into storytelling mode about her 'connection' to Pono (lines 339-342), "I can tell everything, I can read his mind. See--we were born under the same moon." In the story, Leilani differentiated herself as having a psychic connection to Pono. Malia, also using humor, denounced the importance of Leilani's claim that she and Pono "were born under the same moon" because (line 343), "So was everybody else." Malia suggested that the connection between Leilani and Pono was insignificant with her response "so what" (line 345). Leilani's story illustrated her perception that there are times in life when people do not want to do what they are supposed to do. In advocating for Pono, she tacitly indicated her permission for Pono to finish his math homework if he so desired. While Pono seemed to appreciate Leilani's representation of his right to choose, he opted to complete the reading log.

In summary, using humor was a salient form of action with this peer group when dealing with conflict. Humor served to lessen the severity of directives or judgments and to present differences of opinion in a non-adversarial demeanor. It allowed the peer group members not to take situations or themselves too seriously, which could cause tensions to escalate. In these ways, humor served to mediate conflicts and is a implicit component of the next section on mediating tensions. These cultural norms relate to the Hawaiian literature summarized in Chapter II, where even the

most outrageous claims could be acceptably couched in humor. The important stipulation was that these interchanges not be delivered or accepted as serious.

e. Mediating Tensions

Micro-analysis of the transcripts revealed the ways that the peer group members shifted their interactional activities when disagreements or tensions arose. These shifts from "doing English" to "socializing" served to mediate tensions. Instances of the shifts found in transcripts are presented in this section.

The first transcript segment represents the activity shift in transcript #1, when the students were constructing a group plot line:

March 3 - Topic Unit #9 - Plot Line

433 Pono: What?

434 Okay

435 Malia: I was wondering

436 if that happened before the climax?

437 (Next 15 seconds, Kaipo writing, Pono and Malia watching, Leilani reading book silently. Then Malia reaches for her book and reads.)

438 Leilani: What should I put now?

439 Malia: I think that's all.

440 Right after he gets the hoe.

441 He's throwing it,

442 to kill him.

March 3 - TOPIC #10 - Disagreement

443 Leilani: (Loud sigh)

444 All: (GET VERY QUIET)

445 Pono: O-o-oh

446 We argue too much!

March 3 - TOPIC # 11 - Pono's Dropped Pencil

447 (Pono pushes his chair back and starts to crawl under desk, bangs his head on the desk.)

448 Pono: Ouch! (Laughs)

449 Kaipo: What did you DO?

450 (Laughs)

451 Pono: (Bends down under his desk again.)

March 3 - TOPIC #12 - Other Classes

452 Kaipo: (To Malia) You have health?

453 Malia: (Nods to indicate 'yes')

454 Kaipo: What'd we do today?

455 Malia: Correct the guidelines.

456 Leilani: We have health last.

457 Pono: (Brings his head back up above desk.)

458 I had health first.

459 (All quiet again, Malia watches Kaipo write, Leilani twirls her necklace, Pono returns to chair.)

March 3 - TOPIC #13 - Time Limit

460 Kaipo: Uh oh. (Sees teacher watching them off screen)

461 (Slaps his paper) That's it.

462 Teacher: (Off screen) That's five.

463 How close are you?

464 Pono: [Not even!

465 Leilani: [Not even!

466 Teacher: Okay three more minutes

467 Malia: Five.

468 Leilani: How we gonna finish?

469 Pono: Okay

470 Read! Read!

471 Think! Think!

472 Read! Read!

473 Think! Think

March 3 - TOPIC #14 - Plot Line

474 Kaipo: (Reads) So then

475 [he hesitated.

In the March 3 transcript, silence indicated mounting tension between the peer group members at three intervals. After the third instance of silence (line 444), the conversation shifted from "doing English" to "socializing." Pono's exaggerated and humorous reaction to the dropped pencil broke the tension which had escalated to the point of paralyzing the group's activity. The next move, to a discussion of other classes, provided a 'safe' topic of conversation in which each member participated and tenuously reestablished their group identity. The topic of other classes allowed the group members to reconnect before

they attempted "doing English" again. This was significant because the topic, other classes, played a prominent importance early on when Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono were first becoming a group. In both contexts the discussion of other classes served to 'break the ice.'

Another example of a shift from "doing English" to "socializing" was found in Transcript #2. At the point of disagreement, Kaipo called Leilani "Queen Elizabeth" which introduced a story he told the group. "Queen Elizabeth" referred to the role Leilani was playing in a drama club production. Kaipo told the group about a funny incident in which Leilani fell on her way to rehearsal, so the term "Queen Elizabeth" had friendship connotations. Kaipo was with Leilani because she had asked him to accompany her, thus, it was a positive reference to their relationship outside of the classroom.

Kaipo might also have been using the term "Queen Elizabeth" to lower the status that Leilani had assumed when she rebuked his attempts to promote hypothetical discussions of how people can change over time and whether or not friendships can be sustained under those circumstances. She had led the opposition against Kaipo's attempt to substitute peer group members in the role of criminals in the 'what-if' scenarios.

It is probable that both situations influenced Kaipo's decision to call Leilani "Queen Elizabeth." But his presentation of the anecdote in a humorous manner, with

friendship connotations, served to mediate their differences of opinion. Once harmony was reestablished through this "socializing," Kaipo directed the conversation back to "doing English" and his "what-if" topic.

In summary, the results of the data coding process revealed that conflict occurred most often when the group was "doing English." Conflict resolution, on the other hand, was indexed as "socializing" in all but one instance. In Transcript #3, during Topic #1, a disagreement occurred at a time of "socializing" which was resolved when a "doing English" topic was introduced. This episode of disharmony during "socializing" which was mediated by "doing English" provided a contrast from Transcripts #1 and #2 where disagreements occurred while "doing English" and were mediated with "socializing." The topic at the time of the disagreement was "Other Class - Math." Therefore, even though the message units were coded "socializing," the nature of the task was academic and the tone of the talk quite serious. The predominant pattern across the data was that a shift in activity, from "doing English" to "socializing," served to mediate tensions in the face-to-face peer group interactions.

3. Summary of Section C

Features of the face-to-face interactions will be summarized in this section. The two categories of findings encompass features-of-the-talk which differentiated "doing

English" and "socializing" and features-of-the-talk that showed how group harmony was maintained.

Although the students emphasized a back-and-forth pattern of "socializing - doing English - socializing - doing English," the topic analysis and coding of message units showed more evidence of "doing English" than "socializing." The student pattern was found to correlate more closely to the literature on out-of-school adolescent interactional patterns, while the data provided evidence consistent with other educational research. Therefore, it was surmised that the student pattern represented the type of engagement enjoyed most by the peer group members rather than an accurate depiction of classroom activity.

Group harmony or disharmony was affected by the collective agreement required of peer group members while participating in particular face-to-face interactions. Issues that influenced group harmony differed for each the three transcripts selected for microanalysis. One common facet of disharmony across the three transcripts was the status of group members.

The tone of academic and social engagement was characterized with the dimension more serious/more playful. "Socializing" was student-directed and found to be more playful. "Doing English" generally referred to teacher-directed activities and tended to be more serious.

In order to maintain their status within the larger classroom context, peer group members monitored or "busted"

each other to avoid "getting busted" by the teacher. At such times, students assumed authoritative roles congruent with those of the teacher.

Other interactional strategies illuminated matters of potential tension within the small peer group. First, argumentation was acceptable and required in this language arts classroom. The exception was "arguing too much" which was equated with fighting and considered inappropriate. Only "play-fights" were allowable. Secondly, lowering the status of others was not acceptable, nor were statements of self-importance. For this reason group members preferred to address issues of discord among themselves rather than involve the teacher. Third, using humor served to lessen the severity of directives or judgments, present differences of opinion in a non-adversarial demeanor, and mediate tensions. Fourth, because disharmony occurred most often when the group engaged in "doing English," a shift to "socializing" at those points in time facilitated conflict resolution.

D. Relationships and Identities of Peer Group Members

The relationships and identities of the peer group members are reported in this section. These categories were constructed to depict the various forms of participation enacted by Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono through their collective and individual actions. Group affiliation and individual autonomy are categories derived from both the literature on Hawaiian cultural norms and mainland studies of face-to-face interactions. These dimensions depicted a

'intrapersonal' stance toward self or 'interpersonal' stance toward others (as elaborated in Chapters II & III). Utilizing the interpretive framework of Carbaugh (1989), particular identities or enactments of personhood invoked in the terms for talk "doing English" and "socializing" will be rendered as those of student and friend.

1. Group Affiliation and Individual Autonomy

As the students engaged in face-to-face interactions their participation was drawn or pulled in one of two directions; toward group affiliation or individual autonomy. At times, members pulled away from the group in order to engage in individual academic or social agendas. These moves within self reflected a stance toward individual autonomy. Participation that reflected concerted academic or social engagement reflected group affiliation. Within the peer group, members monitored the participatory stance of others. At times it was considered inappropriate to exhibit individual autonomy, particularly when the language arts task assigned called for a cooperative or collaborative result. Peer scoldings were used to admonish such transgressions and served to monitor behaviors deemed inappropriate by group members. At other times individual autonomy was accepted rather than challenged. In those instances, members of the group 'agreed to disagree' rather than attempt to sway or direct the stance of others. "Let' m go" was the term used by the students to indicate that the choice of an individual had been respected. The transcript excerpt below provides such a

situation as the group prepared their interpretation of a poem to share with the class later in the period:

Excerpt from January 6 Transcript:

061	Pono:	I can write it down
062	All:	(write)
063	Leilani:	We have to say it as a team.
064	Pono:	Okay
065		If there be dreams,
066		there will be sadness.
067		Let it be...
068		undreams! (gestures)
069	Malia:	(imitates Pono's gesture)
070		Undreams?
071	Leilani:	[If you're gonna
072	Pono:	[If there be sadness
073	Leilani:	You write what you think
074		an' I'm gonna put mine.

In this short segment the group worked to construct a collaborative interpretation of the poem, as Leilani indicated (line 063), "We have to say it as a team." The oral text the group prepared to share with the whole class however, was not required to be identical to the written interpretation each group member wrote in their English notebooks. As long as a personal reaction was written, individual requirements for the assignment were satisfied.

Leilani's directive to Kaipo (lines 073-074), "You write what you think an' I'm gonna put mine" signified her decision to 'agree to disagree' with Pono's interpretation of the poem. The statement indicated that a stance of individual autonomy was appropriate at that point in time.

In the next transcript, group affiliation and individual autonomy are postured as the students construct a plot line:

March 3 - Topic #5 - Plot Line

335	Pono:	Okay
336		It's here. (Reads his paper)
337		B.D. holds it to the end
338		going back to the sandbar.
339		B.D. back
340		to sandbar
341		to finish.
342	Kaipo:	Huh?
343	Pono:	Yeah?
344		What did you say then?
345	Leilani:	[B. D. breaking the
346	Pono:	[B.D. went to sandbar.
347		Finish.
348	Kaipo:	B.D.
349		B. D. jumps in water
350		Jumps onto sandbar
351		To finish the job.

352 To finish killing the snake.

353 Pono: Does that look good?

March 3 - TOPIC #6 - Disagreement

354 Leilani: I DON'T CARE!

355 (All get very quiet again.)

Pono attempted to engage and seek approval from the irritable Leilani when he asked if the plot line he had constructed up to that point looked good (line 353). Her loud, sarcastic retort of "I DON'T CARE!" (line 354) expressed disregard for the activity and the other participants. Group affiliation was secondary, in this instance, to Leilani's stance of individual autonomy. Her response to Pono was uncharacteristic and nasty, behavior that caused great discomfort to Malia, Kaipo, and Pono. The fact that Leilani wasn't feeling well undoubtedly deterred them from admonishing her. Instead an uncomfortable silence permeated the group. In the next segment, Pono attempted to engage his peers in group affiliation:

356 Pono: We're not getting anything accomplished here people!

357 Think

358 Now think!

359 Kaipo: Big words.

360 Pono: I got

361 No

363 We gotta argue it out an'

364 all have the same thing.

365 So when she collects it

366 we all can have the same thing

367 All: (Get very quiet again)

Pono first scolded the group (lines 356-358) for "not getting anything accomplished" when they had a specific academic agenda and time limit which required their attention. He then demanded the participation of the others in a directive and authoritarian manner, "Think, now think" (lines 357-358). Kaipo's sarcastic response, "Big words" (line 359) indicated that he did not appreciate Pono's assumption of power in attempting to redirect the group. While Kaipo recognized and acknowledged that the group wasn't getting anything done, his sarcastic tone and manner could be interpreted to mean, 'Yeah, and what are you gonna do about it?' Here Pono's scolding irritated Kaipo further, rather than effect any positive change in the already tense group dynamic. As Pono continued, he toned down his authoritarian style, and appealed instead to the members' sense of justice and fair play. Pono delineated the responsibilities that the group members would have to assume if they intended to complete the assignment (lines 360-366), "I got, no, we gotta argue it out an' all have the same thing." The significant

word choices of Pono's reproach were "I" and "we" which served as a metaphor for the dilemma of the group at that point in time; their stances of individual autonomy when group affiliation was required to meet the task demands. Pono's reference to the collective "we" responsibilities also referred back to Leilani's, "I don't care!" statement (line 354). His message indicated that not caring was an unacceptable option here: as a contributing group member, it was Leilani's responsibility to care about the activities of the group and contribute to solving any problems. The interval of silence that followed may have given each group member the opportunity to assess Pono's reasoning as valid. An indication of this possibility was evidenced when Pono initiated plot line discussion after the silence and Leilani, Malia, Kaipo each contributed to the dialog.

Another instantiation of a group member's stance of individual autonomy when group affiliation was required occurred later in the same transcript. This time it was Kaipo who opted for individual autonomy. While Leilani, Pono, and Malia attempted to bring closure to the plot line assignment, Kaipo was quietly "doing his own thing:"

March 3 - TOPIC #18 - Kaipo Doing Own Thing

654	Kaipo:	As you guys've been going along
655		Have you guys noticed
656		That as you guys were going along
657		I never said anything

658		and
659		I have things different
660		from you guys?
661	Pono:	(Takes Kaipo's paper and reads it)
662		What?
663		What' d you do?
664	Kaipo:	(Laughs)
665	M & L:	(Count rising actions.)
666	Pono:	(Shows Kaipo's paper to Leilani and Malia)
667		He said different stuff
668		than us.
669	Malia:	How come you did different stuff?
670	Kaipo:	I don't know.
671		Because
672		I'm not a summary person.
673		I write more specific things.
674	Leilani:	(Reads Kaipo's paper.)
675		You're not supposed to write specific things!
676	Kaipo:	Mine doesn't make sense anyway

The segment began when Kaipo asked the group if they noticed that he had not gone along with them but had instead decided to write different plot line information (lines 654-660). Here Kaipo informed the others of his transgression; they had not noticed his shift in stance. Perhaps, Kaipo was

hoping to be asked to share what he had written and having the results approved or affirmed by Leilani, Malia, and Kaipo. But their attention was directed to activity closure in preparation for the class discussion that was to follow (line 665). After being chastised (lines 666-668), Kaipo seemed to realize that a positive response would not be forthcoming and degraded the form and content of the plot line he had constructed independent of the group. By devaluing his individual autonomy and status as a writer, Kaipo reestablished his group affiliation.

The insights discussed in this section illustrate that both individual autonomy and group affiliation were acceptable participatory stances within the face-to-face peer group interactions. However, individual autonomy was negatively sanctioned by group members when a unified decision in the form of a written or oral response was required. At those times, recorded in the data as "doing English," a stance of individual autonomy interfered with the group affiliation demanded for academic task completion. At all other times, however, individual autonomy was an acceptable option responded to with a "let'm go" or 'agree to disagree' posture. The interactional patterns of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo and Pono were analogous to those of the Hawaiian adolescents studied by Gallimore, Boggs & Jordon; for the most part "it was stressed that if someone did not want to do something, their choice would be respected" (1974, p. 173). Also, in this classroom study, the Hawaiian cultural norm of

collective joint-responsibility may have served to legitimize peer group members holding each other accountable for participation in group assignments.

2. Identities Implicit in the Forms of Talk

As has been previously stated, implicit messages about personhood or identity can be attributed to particular forms of talk (Carbaugh, 1989). In this study the identity aligned with "doing English" was that of being a student. The identity aligned with "socializing" was that of being a friend. Patterns of interaction recorded on the Data Coding Sheets for each of these identities will be expanded in this section.

a. "Doing English" as Being a Student

Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono, labeled any talk directly related to the language arts curriculum "doing English." The functions of "doing English" were associated with those of being a student and on-task engagement in the language arts curriculum. Message units coded "doing English" addressed: teacher directions, literature responses, writing suggestions, record keeping, materials, time limits, and homework. In the interview data, the students explained that on-task talk helped them to "get ideas for writing," to "find which books to read, if they're good or not," and to decide "what to say" when participating in whole class discussions.

The interactional strategies coded most frequently on the Data Coding Sheets as "doing English" included:

clarifying, confirming, assessing, monitoring, and directing. The actions represented roles of the peer group members when they assumed the identity of student. In this section excerpts from the transcripts will be used to further explicate salient interactional strategies.

In the segment below the topic of conversation was the vocabulary posters that were to be completed that day. Three issues were discussed. First Leilani posed questions about requirements of the assignment. Due to her absence on the previous days she needed clarification on a few points. Next, (lines 218-20) Kaipo called attention to his poster lettering, "Nice yeah?" The lack of response to Kaipo may have been connected to the self-congratulatory nature of his remark which indicated an inappropriate assumption of status. It is also possible that the other group members were too involved in their own agendas and paid no attention to Kaipo. The third issue was Malia's dilemma regarding the layout of her poster.

March 18 - TOPIC #10 - Vocabulary Poster

215	Leilani:	Can we type this at home?
216		Or does it like have to be on a certain paper?
217	Malia:	Can type it home. (Laughs)
218	Kaipo:	Nice Yeah?
219		My
220		Lettering?

221 Malia: Oo-o-oh-h! (looks at her paper)

222 Kaipo: What?

223 Malia: Oh man it won't fit.

((Inaudible talk among other group members.))

224 Kaipo: [It will, it will, it will.

225 Malia: [I know con-n-n-n-descending

(Pointing to her poster)

226 Descending

227 Can you read it?

228 All over here?

229 Oo-oh I know, I know, I know,

I know.

230 Condescending (points around the

corner of paper)

231 (Laughs) See?

232 Kaipo: ((Inaudible)) always writes lo-o-o-ng.

DATA CODING SHEET #3

Transcript Date: *March 18* **Topic:** *#10 Vocabulary Poster*

TRANSCRIPTION LINE	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232
CONTENT																		
"Doing English"	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
"Socializing"																		
SOURCE																		
Leilani	●	●																
Malia			●				●		●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Kaipo				●	●	●		●		●								●
Pono																		
Other																		
FORM																		
Statement					●	●			●		●	●				●		●
Question	●	●		●				●					●	●	●		●	
Response			●							●								
Other							●										●	
STANCE																		
Individual Autonomy																		
Group Affiliation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Inter. Strategies																		
Monitoring																		
Requesting	●	●						●					●	●			●	
Agreeing			●															
Disagreeing																		
Directing				●	●	●			●									●
Repeating										●		●			●			
Announcing							●		●		●							
Claiming				●	●	●			●		●				●	●		
Contradicting										●								
Assessing													●	●			●	
Complimenting																		
Pulling away																		
Suggesting										●	●	●						
Ignoring							●											
Using humor																	●	
Confirming			●															
Clarifying		●						●				●		●		●		
Grumbling																		
Bragging				●	●	●												
Scolding																		

Figure 4.6: Data Coding Sheet #3

In the first message units, specifications of the vocabulary posters were discussed. Leilani, who had been absent, requested clarification (line 215) regarding the types of materials that would be appropriate. Malia's response confirmed that there were no rigid requirements regarding the type of paper used for the vocabulary poster (line 216). In this interchange Leilani was able to clarify and confirm the assignment parameters without having to consult with the teacher.

Later, in line 222, Malia directed the conversation to her poster by announcing that her lettering would not fit on the oak tag. Kaipo contradicted and repeatedly suggested that she would find a solution. At that point Kaipo assumed the role of cheerleader, "It will, it will, it will!" (line 224). His action served to encourage Malia to find a solution. In the next seven message units (lines 225-231) Malia explained to Kaipo how she would write the word "condescending" with the c-o-n syllable across the page and d-e-s-c-e-n-d-i-n-g syllables down the page and requested his feedback regarding the effectiveness of her plan. Malia's excitement was evident in (line 229), "Oo-oh, I know, I know, I know, I know." In this interaction Malia suggested possibilities, clarified her ideas, and assessed their effectiveness. Malia was not expecting Kaipo to solve her dilemma, nor did he propose to do so. His role as a 'sounding board' allowed Malia to verbalize her plan and refine it in that process.

In the next segment of the same transcript, after having solved her problem with the poster lettering, Malia directed the conversation to Leilani:

March 18 Transcript Excerpt

233	Malia:	(To Leilani) Are you doin' a story?
234	Leilani:	I did one paragraph
235	Malia:	I mean
236		Yeah,
237		Your paragraph was good,
238		But your story was sorta
239		Duh (laughs)
240	Leilani:	What do you mean?
241		(Laughs)
242		I'm listening!
243	Malia:	Is this gonna be a story?
244		Or is it gonna
245		what's it all about?
246		[Is it a story?
247	Leilani:	[It's a story
248	L & M:	[(Laugh)
249	Malia:	Don't sound like a beginning to me!
250		Sounds like a ending!

DATA CODING SHEET #4

Transcript Date: *March 18* **Topic:** *#10 Vocabulary Poster*

TRANSCRIPTION LINE	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250
CONTENT																		
"Doing English"	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
"Socializing"																		
SOURCE																		
Leilani		●						●	●	●					●	●		
Malia	●		●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●		●	●	●
Kaipo																		
Pono																		
Other																		
FORM																		
Statement			●	●	●	●				●					●		●	●
Question	●							●			●	●	●	●				
Response		●																
Other							●		●							●	●	●
STANCE																		
Individual Autonomy																		
Group Affiliation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Inter. Strategies																		
Monitoring	●			●	●	●	●											
Requesting	●							●			●	●	●	●				
Agreeing				●											●			
Disagreeing																		
Directing																		
Repeating																		
Announcing										●								
Claiming		●																
Contradicting																	●	●
Assessing	●			●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●	●		●	●
Complimenting																		
Pulling away																		
Suggesting																		
Ignoring																		
Using humor							●		●							●	●	●
Confirming				●						●					●			●
Clarifying			●		●	●		●			●	●	●	●				
Grumbling																		
Bragging																		
Scolding																		

Figure 4.7: Data Coding Sheet #4

Here we can see that Malia was monitoring or scanning the group and responded to Leilani's lack of progress on her vocabulary poster. In line 233 Malia asked Leilani, "Are you doin' a story?" directing attention to Leilani's writing. Leilani claimed that she had only written one paragraph. Malia assessed Leilani's first paragraph using humor (lines 235-237) as, "Good, but your story was sorta, duh" (lines 238-239). Leilani acknowledged Malia's assessment of her writing and asked for clarification (lines 240-242), "What do you mean? I'm listening." Malia confirmed and clarified, again using humor, that Leilani was working toward the required genre, "Is this gonna be a story?" (line 243). When Leilani agreed that "It's a story" (line 247), Malia contradicted her (lines 249-250), using humor. Malia made the point that Leilani's beginning sounded like an ending. The implication was that Leilani's written text needed to be lengthier, more than the one paragraph, and include a beginning, middle, and end to be categorized a story.

In this interaction, Leilani had not solicited Malia's assessment of her writing. It was Malia who initiated their conversation when she concluded that Leilani was having difficulty with the assignment. Thus, Malia monitored and assessed the situation, then provided clarification regarding next steps for Leilani, who seemed open to suggestions.

Later in the March 18 class, Kaipo asked the group for clarification regarding activity choices:

March 18 - Topic #15 - Assignment

328 Pono: Um,

329 I can do my math yeah now?

330 Kaipo: No

331 Pono: Can I do my math?

332 If you're all finished?

333 Kaipo: Do your reading record.

334 Malia: Did you do your reading record?

335 Pono: No

336 Malia: Well, do your reading record.

337 Leilani: But he doesn't want to.

338 Pono: Yeah!

DATA CODING SHEET #5

Transcript Date: *March 18* **Topic:** *#15 Assignment*

TRANSCRIPTION LINE	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354
CONTENT																											
"Doing English"	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●											●	●	●	●	●	●
"Socializing"												●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●						
SOURCE																											
Leilani										●		●	●	●	●		●		●		●		●	●	●		●
Malia							●		●							●	●	●	●		●				●		
Kaipo			●			●													●	●	●						
Pono	●	●			●	●			●			●									●	●				●	
Other																											
FORM																											
Statement						●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●				●		●	●	●		●	●
Question		●		●	●		●											●									
Response			●																								
Other	●																●		●		●				●		
STANCE																											
Individual Autonomy												●	●														
Group Affiliation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Inter. Strategies																											
Monitoring			●			●			●	●																	
Requesting	●	●		●	●		●											●									
Agreeing											●														●		●	●
Disagreeing			●																								
Directing		●				●			●													●					
Repeating				●			●		●																		●
Announcing	●											●	●	●	●					●		●					
Claiming								●				●	●	●	●	●				●		●					
Contradicting						●				●														●			
Assessing		●								●								●		●			●			●	●
Complimenting																							●				
Pulling away																											
Suggesting																		●									
Ignoring				●																							
Using humor												●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●				●		●
Confirming		●					●	●	●	●	●												●				
Clarifying			●	●	●	●			●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●						●			
Grumbling																											
Bragging																											
Scolding																											

Figure 4.8: Data Coding Sheet #5

In this segment, Pono requested clarification from his peers (line 329), "I can do my math now, yeah?" He could have decided to finish his math homework, however, the group might have been negatively sanctioned because Pono was off-task. One function of the group was to clarify uncertainties. In response, Kaipo directed Pono, "Do your reading record," (line 333) which was listed on the whiteboard as a legitimate activity. Malia also assessed and monitored Pono by asking if he had completed his reading record. Then she confirmed Kaipo's stance and repeated his directive, "Well, then do your reading record (line 336)." There were two significant dynamics at work here: Pono asked his peers for approval before engaging in an off-task activity because his activity choice would impact the other group members; Kaipo and Malia were very directive in monitoring Pono's activity choices which could affect them as group members.

In summary, the results of the data coding process indicated that monitoring, assessing, directing, clarifying, and confirming were the predominant interactional strategies of group members in the role of student. On the Data Coding Sheets, the following percentages represented the proportion of "doing English" message units: assessing 39%, monitoring 39%, directing 38%, clarifying 34%, and confirming 31%. These reciprocal actions of teacher and learner were expected and enacted when the group members engaged in "doing English."

b. "Socializing" as Being a Friend

All conversations not associated with language arts assignments, or off-task talk, were labeled "socializing." The purposes of "socializing" were associated with being a friend; such as getting to know other group members, sharing personal anecdotes, giving advice, sharing information about assignments or activities in other classes or non-academic school contexts.

On the Data Coding Sheets salient interactional strategies were more varied and inconsistent across instances of "socializing" as compared to the patterns of interactional strategies recorded when the group engaged in "doing English." Using humor was the one consistent salient interactional strategy recorded across instances of "socializing." One purpose of using humor was to introduce a change in topic at a time when group tension emerged. Through such actions, group members demonstrated that their interpersonal relationships as friends took precedence over the academic agenda at a particular point in time. As was stated earlier, these actions provided evidence of the salience of harmony and instantiations of how the group members mediated tensions. The excerpt that follows illustrates these points. In the scenario, Kaipo used humor to introduce the "socializing" topic "Queen Elizabeth" when group tensions had escalated while "doing English." By changing the topic, Kaipo changed the tone and focus of the

interchange to that of friendship when animosity was mounting in the discussion related to the assignment.

March 11 - Topic #2 - New Scenario

047 Kaipo: [No
048 I didn't write about that.
049 Okay.
050 (to Leilani) I told you,
051 Well would you go
052 Would you go up and arrest Pono?
053 You go 'yeah'
054 Leilani: (Points her pencil at Kaipo)
055 No
056 You ding dong. (L & K laugh)
057 I wouldn't do that to Pono.
058 (Hugs Pono)
059 But Pono wouldn't become a criminal!
060 Kaipo: But Pono would've arrested YOU!
061 Pono: I wouldn't become a criminal!
062 Kaipo: H-h-yeah!
063 Well
064 All: (Laugh as Leilani throws pencil at Kaipo.)

March 11 - Topic #3 - Queen Elizabeth

065 Kaipo: Yes, Queen Elizabeth!
066 (Laughter)
067 I remember that,

068		always thought I was ((Inaudible))
069		She did a cartwheel and fell down
070	Malia:	(Getting up from chair)
		Cartwheel downstairs?
071	Kaipo:	No
072		No it was flat.
073	Leilani:	I was on the level part.
074	Pono:	With a bag on (meaning backpack)
075		and everything?
076	Leilani:	No
077		I slipped because my shoes were wet.

DATA CODING SHEET #6

Transcript Date: *March 11* **Topic:** #2 & #3

TRANSCRIPTION LINE	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
CONTENT																											
"Doing English"	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●									
"Socializing"																			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
SOURCE																											
Leilani								●	●	●	●	●	●					●									●
Malia																		●						●			
Kaipo	●	●	●	●	●	●	●							●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	
Pono															●			●									
Other																											
FORM																											
Statement		●	●	●	●		●			●	●		●		●						●	●	●				●
Question						●																		●			
Response	●								●					●		●	●		●						●	●	
Other								●		●		●						●		●							
STANCE																											
Individual Autonomy																											
Group Affiliation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Inter. Strategies																											
Monitoring																		●									
Requesting																								●			
Agreeing																											●
Disagreeing		●							●																		
Directing			●					●					●					●	●		●	●	●				
Repeating				●	●	●	●							●													
Announcing	●		●										●		●	●	●				●	●	●			●	●
Claiming	●							●		●					●												●
Contradicting	●							●	●					●	●										●		
Assessing										●								●	●								
Complimenting																											
Pulling away																											
Suggesting													●						●								
Ignoring																											
Using humor										●						●	●	●	●	●							
Confirming											●	●															
Clarifying		●		●	●	●	●							●										●	●	●	●
Grumbling																											
Bragging																											
Scolding										●																	

Figure 4.9: Data Coding Sheet #6

On the Data Coding Sheets using humor was found to be the salient interactional strategy employed in the role of being a friend. Of the total 483 message units coded "socializing," 207 or 43% denoted using humor. The less serious/more playful tone of "socializing" was discussed earlier. The purposes of "socializing" could also be described as less serious and more playful. In the role of friend, group members learned about each other's lives outside of the classroom, were helpful and supportive of each other in times of need. They also joked and poked fun at each other or particular situations, either to lessen the serious nature of an interaction or just to have a good time. Each of the group members reported that having fun and developing friendships were factors related to their enjoyment of English class. It could be that the students valued their ownership of the topics and agendas of "socializing" within the parameters of the classroom. As such "socializing" served to balance the more serious teacher-directed interactions which were more characteristic of "doing English."

c. Melding of Purposes and Identities

A group dynamic not clearly discerned in the above discussion of "doing English" and "socializing" was that the friendship qualities most distinctive in the off-task interactions of the group, over time, became central features of their academic endeavors as well. Two examples will be used to illustrate the melding of identities.

In the January 6 transcript, Malia expressed concerns about not having her poetry collection up-to-date. She shared her dilemma with Leilani. Then Malia realized that her confession had been recorded on the video camera, "Oh my God! I said something stupid! On the camera! (lines 028-032). In friendship, Leilani assured Malia that there was not a problem, by declaring that she said similar things all the time (lines 031- 034). Then they continued to converse about poetry collections.

January 6 - Transcript

021	Malia:	Did you finish?
022		Your poetry collection?
023		I still have ta type
024		and color it.
025		Good thing there's no
026		Good thing there's no practice today!
027		Oh my God!
028		I said something stupid!
029		On the camera!
030	Leilani:	It's okay.
031		I always say something,
032		something stupid,
033		on the camera.
034	Malia:	Is that yours?
		(They talk about Leilani's
		poetry collection.)

In the interview segment below, Leilani revealed personality traits that she and Kaipo had helped each other acknowledge and try to improve. The less-than-complimentary characteristic attributed to Leilani was "being-so-bossy" and Kaipo was labeled a "know-it-all."

Leilani's Interview

They helped me see that I was bossy, I thought I was bossy. Kaipo was the one that always told me that, yeah. "Well, you know, you're so bossy." And I would be telling him, "Shut up Kaipo." And he goes, "Well, you are." And I said, "I know." And then kinda stopped after that. I said, "Yeah, I guess I am." And after awhile, I kinda tried not to be so insistent on everything in the group. I would try to sit down on the side and then try to listen to what everybody else said and try to encourage what everybody else said instead of just what I was saying. And I would tell Kaipo, cuz me and Kaipo--we not 'shame. We tell each other what we think of the other person, good or bad. And I'll tell him, "Kaipo, stop actin' like you know it all." And he would say, "I don't know it all." And I'd say, "Yes, you do!" And then he'd laugh and then he'd say, "Oh, well, maybe sometimes I do."

There were occasions when Leilani and Kaipo were silently irritated with each other's enactments of "being so bossy" or "know-it-all" which usually surfaced when the group was "doing English." Over time, as they became friends and were able to share feelings more openly, these less redeeming qualities were made explicit to the offender. In that way episodes of "doing English" that proved to be irritating were pointed out. These disclosures, however, were made as humorous gestures of friendship. At first, both Leilani and Kaipo denied the appropriateness of the labels, then acknowledged them to be true, and attempted to affect changes in their interactional participation. Leilani and Kaipo did not believe they would have shared so openly with peers they did not know well or identify as friends.

The melding of purposes, those related to being a student and those related to being a friend, became more prominent as the history of the group evolved.

3. Summary of Section D

In this section the roles and relationships of the peer group members were discussed. Insights related to group and individual dynamics and identities that corresponded to social and academic activities indexed in the data coding process will be summarized below.

Both individual autonomy and group affiliation were appropriate participatory stances within the face-to-face interactions. However, group affiliation was required and expected when a unified decision in the form of a written or

oral response was required of the group. At other times individual autonomy was respected, as evidenced in the "let' em go" and 'agree to disagree' responses. These categories relate to interactional norms in other face-to-face research of Hawaiian and mainland peer groups.

"Doing English" corresponded to the identity of student. The most salient interactional strategies of the peer group members in this role were monitoring, directing, assessing, confirming, and clarifying. These reciprocal actions related to the language arts curriculum and defined the roles of the students in this peer group as including both teaching and learning.

"Socializing" corresponded to the identity of friend. The most salient interactional strategy was using humor. All non-language arts interactions were encompassed in this category of talk: getting to know each other, interests outside of school, clothes and hair, boyfriends and girlfriends, other classes, and many others. Friendships between and among the group members promoted connectedness, harmony, and the ability to have fun.

Over time, the distinctions of friend and student melded. There was evidence of friendship matters identified during "doing English" and discussion of academic interactional styles during "socializing."

E. Review of the Findings

From the data analysis in Chapter IV, I have presented findings related to what was accomplished in the face-to-face

peer group interactions of four seventh grade Hawaiian students who were assigned to work together in their English language arts class. The following is a summary list of the findings:

1. Student Perspective

- The terms "doing English" and "socializing" were the two salient categories of face-to-face interactions. These were student labels utilized to differentiate on-task and off-task engagement in this language arts classroom.
- The four individual students became a group over time. The participants claimed that the history of their group affected the comfort level of the members and the nature of their conversations.
- Group harmony was maintained by assessing and influencing moods; engaging in conflict resolution; referring to each other in kinship terms.

2. Features of the Talk

- The student identified pattern of "socializing - doing English - socializing - doing English" did not accurately reflect activity engagement recorded across the data. In the conversational analysis, academic engagement was more predominant than social engagement. The student pattern was more comparable with out-of-school activity engagement of adolescents reviewed in the literature and could be interpreted as

reflecting preferred rather actual norms of interaction of the peer group members.

- The issues of consensus or collective agreement which influenced group harmony included: the nature of the task; mood of the participants; status of group members; and "getting busted" by the teacher.
- The nature of activity involvement influenced the tone of the interactions; student-directed events were more playful, teacher-directed activities more serious.
- Peer group members monitored or "busted" each other to avoid "getting busted" by the teacher. At those times, students assumed authoritative roles congruent with those of the teacher in the larger classroom context.
- Arguing was an appropriate form of interaction; differences of opinion were acceptable and required in the language arts classroom. "Arguing too much" was inappropriate.
- Fighting was seen as immature, irresponsible and inappropriate; an activity of children. An exception was a "play-fight," or humorous exchange.
- Lowering the status of others was not acceptable; nor were statements of self-importance.
- Group members preferred to address issues of discord among themselves rather than involve the teacher.

- Humor was used to lessen the severity of directives or judgments, to present differences of opinion in a non-adversarial demeanor, and to mediate tensions.
- Conflict occurred most often when the group was "doing English."
- A shift in activity, from "doing English" to "socializing," facilitated conflict resolution.

3. Relationships and Identities

- Both individual autonomy and group affiliation were acceptable and respected stances within the face-to-face interactions. However, group affiliation was required and expected when a unified decision in the form of a written or oral response was necessary to complete the task at hand. Individual autonomy was respected as evidenced in the "let'm go" and 'agree to disagree' scenarios.
- "Doing English" was associated with the identity of student. Roles of teaching and learning included assessing, monitoring, directing, clarifying, and confirming.
- "Socializing" was associated with the identity of friend. The predominant interactional strategy was using humor.
- Over time the implicit identities of student and friend became less distinct.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

A. Discussion

This dissertation investigated the peer group talk of four Hawaiian seventh graders in an English language arts class. The focus addressed what was being accomplished in these face-to-face interactions. The discussion that follows is organized around the three research questions that framed the study. Although the findings are discussed as separate entities in relation to each of the research questions, the dynamics were complexly interwoven and interrelated.

1. Research Question #1

The first question concerned the students' perceptions of their face-to-face interactions:

> How did the students label and describe their interactive accomplishments?

Carbaugh's (1989) "terms for talk" framework was employed to examine language descriptions the seventh grade participants utilized in reference to their peer group interactions in English class. I referred closely to student characterizations of their accomplishments and corresponding terms for talk which categorized classroom events in constructing the descriptions.

My research builds on the work of Baxter and Goldsmith (1990) who used the terms for talk framework to identify various communicative events differentiated by a group of high school students. Using ethnographic interviewing,

participant observation, and cluster analysis they identified nine categories of talk and five semantic dimensions of communication in "an attempt to paint in broad strokes the landscape of communication events among some American adolescents" (1990, p. 392). In contrast, using micro ethnographic methods, I examined the particularities (Bloome & Bailey, 1992) of an adolescent peer group in their enactments of two salient classroom activities.

Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono referred to their activities as "doing English" and "socializing." Use of these terms was not profound, since educators have long recognized social and academic agendas in the classroom. As such, this investigation parallels other studies of student-student interactions as social constructions of learning. This study contributes corroborating instantiations of academic and social engagement defined by the student participants.

The ability of the participants to categorize and label their activities aligns their perceptions with those of educators in recognizing social and academic agendas in the classroom. The student definitions also distinguished off and on-task interactions particular to the English classroom as was indicated in their assessment of conversations related to other classes, which were academic in nature, as "socializing." This distinction provided evidence of student knowledge that "doing English" was required to participate appropriately in this classroom context; and recognition of

"socializing" as an acceptable, prominent, and purposeful activity within the small peer group and larger classroom contexts.

Another accomplishment described by the students concerned their evolving collective identity. The four participants became a group over time; the longevity of their learning community affected the comfort level of the members and the nature of their conversations. The students described their initial interactions as little more than being seated together and assigned particular language arts tasks. The classroom, then, was purposefully arranged to enhance face-to-face interactions, as groups of four students worked together at assigned tables. However, their initial conversations paralleled those of Bruffee's college groups, where "students start most semesters in the classroom as strangers. They do not begin,...as trusted neighbors, colleagues, or friends" (1993, p. 27). In both cases collective identity evolved over time.

Although this concept appears to be self-evident, group history is not readily acknowledged in educational literature (Gilles, 1991; Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992b; Bloome & Bailey, 1992). This study suggests that the typically transient nature of membership in classroom peer groupings may need to be reconsidered. The longevity of the group influenced the meanings created and negotiated recursively over time. For Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono, a cumulative history functioned to promote group cohesion and richer

conversations while "doing English" and "socializing." The fact that they participated in cooperative and collaborative activities for approximately six months allowed for the further development of their connectedness and self-proclaimed identity as an *'ohana*.

The preference for group harmony has been identified as a cross-cultural norm of interaction in the Hawaiian and mainland literature reviewed in Chapter II. Understanding the significance of the kinship term *'ohana* explicated the importance attributed to maintaining group harmony and having fun within this peer group. D'Amato's (1986) research of the interactional structure of the Hawaiian social world provided an explanation of the usage of kinship terms:

> Expressions of solidarity are as involved in Hawaiian home life as Hawaiian school life. The Hawaiian social world is a heavily peopled and very active one...But kinship constructs are not used solely to denote genealogical relationships. They are also used quite freely as metaphors for solidarity. The ideal is for all people of a household to be made to feel as though they were family...Represented in the Hawaiian's use of kinship metaphors with friends, in their willingness to offer help and hospitality to others, and in their readiness and seemingly inexhaustible capacity for interaction, are home life counterparts to the strong expressions of solidarity which Hawaiian

children are capable of giving to one another at school (D' Amato, 1986, p. 190).

In order to be identified as a group, the combined individual members must form linkages and affiliations (Phinney, 1992). Each group builds connections in their own unique ways. The cultural concept of *'ohana* served to strengthen the solidarity and harmony of this group of Hawaiian students.

The findings of this study support the research of numerous other educators in advocating for peer group talk in the classroom (see Wilkinson, 1982; Bloome, 1987; Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992b; Green & Dixon, 1983; Marshall, 1994; Pierce, Gilles & Barnes, 1993; and others). The perspective of the students provided corroborating evidence of what can be accomplished in these face-to-face interactions.

2. Research Question #2

The second question allowed for further description and interpretation of the student categories "doing English" and "socializing."

What communicative features characterized academic and social engagement?

The interpretive theory of Carbaugh (1989) was utilized to denote "instances-of-the-terms-for-talk" and prominent "features-of-the-talk" identified in the data analysis process. In this way my analysis further explicated the

student perspective presented in the previous section. Features of the interactions were aligned with studies of Hawaiian interactional patterns and more recent investigations of face-to-face interactions in educational contexts (summarized in the literature review). References to this literature will provide comparisons for this discussion of communicative features of the talk.

In the process of examining the data for substantiation of the student identified pattern of equal engagement between academic and social agendas, a discrepancy was noted (as discussed in Chapter IV). Across the data, "socializing" was not a predominant form of interaction within a given class period. However, as validated in the March 18 transcript, during particular classes more social talk was recorded. These contexts were student work periods which closely resembled out-of-school adolescent interactions with a great deal of off-task talk which was more playful and less serious in tone than academic engagement. The inclusion of student directed 'open' classes into the schedule periodically enabled group members to explore topics and share personal anecdotes not considered to be curricular, though still defined as learning opportunities. As such, "socializing" and "doing English" were recognizable and functional features of life in this particular classroom.

Shifts from "doing English" to "socializing" also served to mediate tensions at times of disagreement by allowing a 'time out' from the academic issue around which the

disharmony centered. Thus, an interesting dynamic emerged; although teachers could be expected to value "doing English" and probably find "socializing" a nuisance, the data seemed to show that "socializing" promoted collective identity which positively affected engagement of the group members when "doing English." These findings contribute to the literature on face-to-face interactions by legitimizing "socializing" or off-task talk as an activity form that can serve to expedite on-task or academic interactions such as "doing English."

In their investigation of communication in Hawaiian peer groups and school experiences, Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordon (1974) found that the interactions of adolescent peers emphasized egalitarianism; they strived to maintain equitable status. "In the peer group, the norm is spontaneous, light-hearted interaction without the intrusions of superior status and power of the kind they must accept from elders" (1974, p. 167). The notion of egalitarianism was also implicit in the student descriptions of their interactions in my study. However, transgressions were found in the data, usually when the group was "doing English." The disharmony arose when one of the peer group members assumed a status above the others, similar to the role of an adult, who in a school context would be the teacher. For example, when Pono scolded the group using what Kaipo called "big words" in the March 3 transcript. The generational organization that typifies Hawaiian face-to-face interactions provided an explanation of this phenomenon.

Howard (1974), Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordon (1974) and D' Amato (1987), utilized the label "peer orientation" in their descriptions of the hierarchy that delineates the authority of older generations of family members. In a peer-oriented system, members of different generations function together in the same household, but communicate mostly with those of the same generation: adults with adults, adolescents with adolescents, children with children. D' Amato (1986) elaborated the implications of this generationally organized interactional system with regard to adult expectations of children. Because there is much less face-to-face interaction between children and adults, two norms of interaction are sanctioned: adults establish strict rules regulating activities that the children can or cannot participate in; and the collective group of children are held jointly responsible for their actions by adults.

This ideology of joint responsibility may relate to the reluctance, on the part of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono, to elicit advice from the teacher when working toward an assigned language arts goal. In one transcript, Kaipo told Pono, "Do it yourself," when Pono was about to ask the teacher a question. The group also demonstrated independence and solidarity when Mrs. Smith inquired, "Are we fighting here children?" Another time Leilani indicated that she felt obligated to warn Miki, at the next table, to be quiet when Mrs. Smith was talking so he would not "get busted." The notion of joint responsibility may also have been the

underlying reason for Pono's decision to complete his reading record rather than finishing math homework during the student-directed work period.

Gallimore and Howard describe Hawaiians as more affiliation-oriented than ethnic groups on the mainland whose values tend to be achievement-oriented:

> Because of the importance of affiliative relationships, much effort in the Hawaiian community is directed toward avoiding interpersonal conflict or social disharmony. The general strategy for achieving the comfortableness that characterizes Hawaiian social relations entails the willingness to minimize personal gain in order to maximize interpersonal harmony and satisfaction. This strategy is of course most clearly seen in those situations in which personal benefit is at odds with avoidance of conflict and disharmony (Gallimore & Howard, 1968, p. 10).

This interactional strategy of minimizing one's own importance seems connected to the self-deprecating remarks utilized by the peer group members at times of disagreement with other members. Such an instance occurred when Kaipo was "doing his own thing" and then denigrated his writing in order to realign himself with the other group members and bring closure to their plot line. Leilani used a similar tactic when she mocked her own writing with Kaipo and Malia as "too intimate," though she continued her intimate story in

her private writing, away from the group. In these ways, disparity in the status of group members was minimized.

Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordon described interactional patterns of Hawaiian peer groups in this way, "Decision making among peers can be conceptualized as a shared-function initiative; thus peer leadership is a briefly held, shifting role" (1974, p. 173). The roles of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono also were briefly held and shifting. At times Leilani was seen as the writing expert, yet at other times she enlisted the help of her peers because she didn't know what to write. Sometimes Pono was the group leader, at other times his peers directed his actions. Evidence of "shared-function initiatives" has also been reported in mainland studies of peer group interactions. Phinney (1992), Dyson (1989), Cooper, Marquis, and Ayers-Lopez (1982) found that leadership roles were shared and exchanged when peers who considered themselves to be friends worked together on literacy projects.

Ludlam's (1993) study of mainland adolescents presents a dissimilar pattern. In the vocational high school writing group, a leader emerged and sustained that position of status for a period of time. Then, a change in group membership resulted in an overthrow in the leadership role. For Ludlam's group, writing achievements determined the status of the group members. In my study, attempts to claim a higher status because of literacy proficiency did not meet with support from other group members. Assuming a role of leader,

director, or critic equaled the assumption of a higher, more adult-like status which was not recognized positively by the other group members. The exceptions to this rule were instances of using humor.

Cazden (1988) referred to humor as a basic socialization strategy infrequently mentioned by observers. Davies (1982) found that humor was a dominant element in her interactions with ten and eleven year old children. Gilles (1991) noted examples of humor in all transcripts, during book discussions, word play, and teasing of group members. Eder (1993), while studying peer relations and culture in a junior high school setting, found that the adolescent girls used humorous teasing to emphasize the collaboration of the group and minimize issues of jealousy and tension. The outcome was that humorous teasing strengthened female friendships and enhanced group solidarity. In their Hawaiian study, Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordon (1974) found that peer group members insulted or scolded each other using humor, "in a joking way," with regularity. That way, aggressive assertions or displays of boldness were sanctioned by group members because they were "only a joke." Criticisms, severe assessments, insults, and even threats, if delivered in a jocular manner and followed by laughter, were allowable. "The cardinal rule seems to be -- avoid any sign of assuming authority and allow any comment to be overlooked as only a joke" (Gallimore, Boggs, & Jordon, 1974, p. 171). Humor was

also a prominent feature of the interactions of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo and Pono and promoted group harmony.

The references to earlier Hawaiian research have implicitly recognized egalitarianism as an issue of group harmony. The findings of other researchers regarding preferences for harmony in peer group interactions were similar. Eckert (1993), in her study of cooperative competition in adolescent "girl talk" found that consensus was negotiated by establishing a middle ground, or a position that represented both sides of an issue and eliminated disagreement. Similar to my study and Ludlam's (1993), Eckert(1993) found that shared norms of interaction implied the development of a community of learners, and the building of community was affirmed through the negotiation of interactional norms by the peer group members.

Shared norms or interactional strategies of the talk imply the existence of a community, and the negotiation of interactional norms both affirms and requires community. The concept of community builds as the history of the group evolves and progresses (Eckert, 1993).

One communicative feature of this investigation that differed from previous research on Hawaiian interactional patterns was the positive perception of arguing. In this study, arguing was found to be an acceptable and necessary form of interaction in the process of reaching consensus within the peer group. Members encouraged each other to argue their point of view in the interest of group harmony.

Fighting, on the other hand, indicated that the interlocutor had carried arguing too far, so as to be offensive, which resulted in disharmony. Thus, consensus was predicated on shared interactional norms of the participants as a group.

Trimbur contended that the perception of consensus must be amended (beyond the definition of Bruffee) so as not to stifle individual voice and creativity, suppress differences, and enforce conformity:

> Consensus need not inevitably result in accommodation. The politics of consensus depends on the teacher's practice. Consensus ... can be a powerful instrument for students to generate differences, to identify the systems of authority that organize these differences, and to transform the relations of power that determine who may speak and what counts as a meaningful statement (Trimbur, 1992, p. 209).

This "revised notion of consensus" provides a framework for further exploration of the issues of consensus presented in this study and just how explicit those assumptions were to the participants.

Solomon (1980), proposed an educational model which combined research on Hawaiian interactional patterns and established educational practices. The salient Hawaiian values included in the model were: self-help, mutual assistance, cooperative living, attitudes of friendliness and generosity (1980, p. 122). My research is aligned with

Solomon in that aspects of the face-to-face interactions of this group of seventh graders depict qualities identified in the earlier Hawaiian studies. However, in the last twenty years, similar patterns have been identified in peer group interactions of non-Hawaiians. It is for this reason that I have attempted to bring both bodies of research together in this discussion. While certain characteristics may be more typical of Hawaiian interactional patterns, they are not exclusively Hawaiian. Issues of group solidarity, preferences for harmony and egalitarian status, and uses of humor can be seen across studies of adolescent peer group interactions, just as academic and social agendas can be found in many educational contexts. Each of these issues related to the significance of "socializing" in relation to "doing English" in my study.

3. Research Question #3

The third question concerned interpersonal dynamics of the participants foregrounded in their face-to-face interactions:

What relationships and identities were enacted in the peer group talk?

Intra/interpersonal relationships at work for the peer group members studied were depicted in their differential stances toward individual autonomy or group affiliation denoted on the Data Coding Sheets. The dycotomy involved the

moment-by-moment decisions of the participants to be pulled within self or toward others as described in the literature review.

The precarious balance of individual autonomy and group affiliation was identified by Gallimore, Boggs and Jordon (1974) in their description of Hawaiian peer group interactions. When studying how groups of adolescent friends made decisions in out-of-school contexts, Gallimore et al. (1974) found that suggestions were made, a general agreement of an appropriate solution was reached, but the final choice of activity was left up to the individual who decided whether or not to go along with the others. Their findings connect to the "let' m go" and 'agree to disagree' responses in my data and the fact that disparity regarding individual autonomy or group affiliation did not emerge when Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono were "socializing."

Circumstances in which the assumption of a particular stance proved to be problematic occurred while the peer group engaged in "doing English." Additionally, the problem involved a stance of individual autonomy by a student when group affiliation was required for the academic task at hand. At such times the Hawaiian notion of joint responsibility allowed students to negatively sanction other peer group members. In so doing the students indicated that each member was expected to pull their weight in the group.

This interactional pattern parallels the category "monitor of knowledge" identified by Collins (1990) in her

study of a fourth-fifth grade class to explain a teacher role of redirecting the attention of students with the implicit message, "What are you doing right now?" (cf. Collins & Green, 1994, p. 64). In the classroom studied by Collins and Green, the role of monitor was not enacted by students. In my study, when stances of individual autonomy and group affiliation clashed, Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, or Pono served as "monitors of knowledge" within their small group context by chastising and redirecting the participatory stance of the offending group member. These student actions often eliminated the need for teacher intervention in the role of "monitor of knowledge" and demonstrated "a pattern of interaction which diminished the historical asymmetry between roles of teacher and students at particular points in time" (Collins & Green, 1994, p. 64). The salience of both individual autonomy and group affiliation across the data indicated that within this peer group learning was defined both personally and socially (Collins & Green, 1994).

The identities or personhood of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono which corresponded to their terms-for-talk "doing English" or "socializing" were those of 'student' and 'friend' respectively. "Doing English" involved accomplishments connected to the language arts curriculum. Assuming the identity of student included participating in conversations including but not limited to: teacher directions, literature responses, writing topics and suggestions for improvement, record keeping, use of

materials, time limits, homework assignments, recommending books for pleasure reading, deciding what to contribute to whole class discussions. The most salient interactional strategies of the students included monitoring, assessing, directing, confirming, and clarifying each others academic endeavors. These reciprocal actions typified the teaching and learning strategies utilized within the small group context and compare to other studies of classroom peer learning (Cooper, Marquis, & Ayers-Lopez, 1982; Phinney, 1992; Gilles, 1993; and others). The 'student' accomplishments of the peer group members closely paralleled two roles and relations identified by Collins (1990). As "facilitators of knowledge" the most frequent forms of talk included requests, clarifications, and direction on projects. "Generators of knowledge" presented or shared particular forms of information in large or small groups. Collins and Green elaborated the implications of abdicating these traditional teacher roles to students:

> By "handing over" (Edwards & Mercer, 1987) responsibility for actions and knowledge to students and by constructing expectations of shared responsibility for learning...students often initiated the topic of discussion, asked for resources, and introduced resources they found. Students also provided resources for other students without consultation with the "teacher"

> and thus assumed the role of instructor for other students for particular periods of time (Collins & Green, 1994, p. 65).

Here the term 'shared responsibility' used by Collins and Green defined roles of the students which have been traditionally allocated to the teacher and relate to the Hawaiian cultural norm of "joint responsibility" shared by peer group members in out-of-school contexts. These understandings can be employed to interpret the face-to-face interactions of Leilani, Malia, Kaipo and Pono in the role of student as providing opportunities for the construction of knowledge through culturally congruent means.

The identity foregrounded when peer group members engaged in "socializing" was that of a friend. Topics included off-task talk, or conversations unrelated to the English language arts curriculum. As such, my findings present a corollary to the research of Ludlam (1992), Gilles (1991, 1993), Cone (1993) in recognizing the value of "socializing" as an activity form in the classroom independent of a literacy agenda. In the data "socializing" involved peer group members in conversations which served to promote group connectedness and camaraderie. Friendship conversations enhanced the participation of the peer group members when "doing English" because their comfort and knowledge of each other had evolved to a higher level. Secondly, off-task or social talk served to mediate tensions

that emerged during academic interactions (as has been previously discussed). Thus, for this particular peer group, "socializing" most often functioned as a purposeful activity form within the language arts classroom. That is not to say, however, that "socializing" was always appropriate, as demonstrated in the section on "getting busted."

The melding of student and friend identities was demonstrated when Leilani and Kaipo owned up to and addressed their respective labels of "being-so-bossy" and "know-it-all." Only over time and in social conversations were they able to broach these academic issues. Such candor would not have been shared in more superficial relationships. The participation of group members was influenced by their evolving identities as friends and students within the peer group structure. As such the conditions for learning in this language arts classroom enabled the students to construct unique social and academic knowledge (Collins & Green, 1994).

B. Implications

Although there has been an increase in ethnographic research of classroom interactions, relatively few studies have focused on the face-to-face interactions of students engaged in peer group activities apart from the teacher or whole class setting (Floriana, 1994; Forman & Cazden, 1985). Similarly, academic and social agendas have long been recognized in educational research; however, there has not been a close examination of the interactional patterns or significance of these language forms. "Talking about school

work and personal agenda talk events were taken-for-granted features of daily life" for the adolescents studied by Baxter and Goldsmith (1990, p. 389). An understanding of the functions of social talk in relation to academic talk within one small peer group has implications for teaching and further research which will be explored in the next two sections.

1. Implications for Teaching

Teachers of the English language arts have the responsibility to provide ample opportunities for student conversations; to promote many different kinds of talk; to facilitate the development of skills necessary to use language for a full range of social and intellectual functions; and to recognize the significance of context in language and learning (Pinnell & Jaggar, 1992). Solsken writes that from a social construction of literacy perspective "literacy is defined as a community's ways of using written language to serve social purposes, and learning is seen as the process of adopting community practices for using and interpreting written language through participation in its social life" (1993, p. 4). These perspectives on language were implicit tenets of this dissertation which contributes to an increased understanding of the social organization of learning.

The interactional accomplishments of one peer group were explored and substantiated in the ethnographic research

process. The findings support Cazden's (1988) assertion that participation in peer group conversations allows students to practice academic talk without the direct authoritarian presence of the teacher. The classroom studied was organized to facilitate formal and informal peer group interactions, thus foregrounding sociality. The collegiality of the group members before and after 'official' class time was comparable to the informal conversations of groups or committees that are prominent in the adult world (Cazden, 1988). The configuration of the context and interactional opportunities available to the Hawaiian students also provided culturally compatible structures and processes (D'Amato, 1986, 1993). The peer group, therefore, was found to be a beneficial pedagogical construct. However, I concur with the position of Barnes and Todd in "not claiming that all educational purposes can be carried out in small groups" (1995, p. 166).

In this study student-directed activities tended to be more playful and social; while teacher-directed tasks were more serious and academic in nature. The parameters of academic tasks also influenced the face-to-face interactions, as evidenced in Transcript #1 when a group plot line was constructed following specified guidelines. The requirement of unified agreement regarding the story analysis forced the group to address issues of discord that had not surfaced in other situations where a variety of opinions were allowable and acceptable. As shown in Chapter IV, participation in the

plot line interaction involved precarious balances between arguing and fighting, and preserving the status of group members while making one's point. For this group of Hawaiian students, who tended to be extremely uncomfortable with disharmony, confronting peers to assert a contradictory point of view offered an important opportunity for the development of a necessary life skill. This instance exemplifies how the structure of classroom tasks impact group interactions. It is important for teachers to observe students engaged in a variety of tasks and encourage reflection on the new understandings acquired in order to facilitate the development of a wide range of social and intellectual language use (Beach & Hynds, 1990).

A salient finding of this study involved the dynamic interplay between social and academic agendas, particularly the value of socializing within the classroom context. Conversations that on the surface could be deemed a waste of valuable class time were found to be purposeful in fostering collective group identity, mediating tensions that arose during academic engagement, and developing social and personal identities. A key factor was the physical setup of the classroom which encouraged conversations between students. Classrooms organized to impede student-student interactions perpetuate tradition notions of teaching and learning which have been theoretically challenged in recent decades. Educational environments that promote peer group conversations allow students to more

actively engage in the social construction of learning espoused by contemporary educational theorists.

The longevity of the group also proved to be a key factor. It was only over time that group members delved beyond superficial social and academic agendas and when feelings of *'ohana* influenced the group. Even when the students engaged in whole class and various other groupings (in terms of size and time spent together) across the study, it was their identity as members of Table #3 that fostered the most indepth social and academic interactions. This insight suggests further consideration of the transient groupings typical of most classroom contexts. The range and depth of face-to-face interactions becomes greater as the history of the peer group evolves.

The insights gleaned from this study suggest new ways of thinking about schooling. The social context of classroom learning is a community with shared rules, codes of conduct, and speech interpretations (Hymes, 1974). The cultural identity of the community is put on display as members communicate in their own unique ways (Carbaugh, 1990). The evolution of a community is continuous and influenced by its history, agenda and purpose, needs, social structure and power distribution, relationships to other communities, and institutional context (Bloome, 1989). Interactional opportunities and forms of engagement affect and are affected by each of these factors. In academic discourse, the context that offers students an active form of participation in this

socialization process is the peer group (Cazden, 1988). Utilization of peer group learning permits educators to observe and analyze the learning that is possible when students direct their interactions within the parameters of the educational context. These conversations are usually quite different than those found during teacher-class or teacher-student interactions. As such peer groups provide unique language contexts which expand definitions of what counts as learning in the classroom.

2. Implications for Further Research

Recent ethnographic research has begun to uncover the nuances of face-to-face interactions in education. This study contributes to an increased understanding of the interplay of social and academic agendas. The ethnographic methodology recognized the classroom members as observer-analysts of their face-to-face interactions in school. The students categorized their endeavors with the academic and social labels "doing English" and "socializing." The resultant descriptions and interpretations theoretically align with Phinney's (1992) assertion (regarding sociality and writing) that a theory of schooling needs to recognize the social agendas of students to fully reflect the nature of learning.

Peer group conversations engage students in the negotiation and construction of social and academic scenarios. Certainly the presence of a researcher impacted this study, but because I was not the classroom teacher and

tried to remain as non-judgmental as possible, I believe the data closely depicted what 'really goes on here.' This eavesdropping, if you will, as the researcher, allowed for the careful investigation of behind the scenes information that teachers are not often privy to in their own classrooms. The perspective of researcher-informed-by-participants adds to the knowledge base of face-to-face interactions in educational settings by exploring what gets talked about and what influences the conversations of students.

The results of this study also suggest the importance of not focusing too narrowly on particular cultural characteristics, since the findings were consistent with both the research on Hawaiian cultural patterns and with other research on adolescents. For example, the salience of arguing as a means of promoting harmony for this peer group contrasted with previous Hawaiian research while the significance of using humor has been documented in both Hawaiian and mainland research of adolescent peer groups. Research that assumes everything is tied to ethnicity may be missing connections to other social and cultural patterns.

This examination of particular terms for talk, topics, features, roles, relationships, and identities substantiated "socializing" as a valuable, purposeful classroom activity. The findings were limited to one mixed gender focus group of four Hawaiian students in a seventh grade language arts classroom. Further research is needed to study how

socializing functions in other settings, with other participants, in different circumstances.

a. Settings

A study of several peer groups within one classroom would provide an interesting comparison of the ways that various peer groups interpret or enact social and academic agendas. For although the teacher may have one agenda for a class, the actual enactment of that agenda varies from group to group. The comparison of peer group talk across content areas classes would provide a comparison of the nature of the student-student conversations that emerge from various types of school settings. Duplicating this study across grade levels would allow for the research of developmental trends or shifts that are salient.

b. Participants

The participants in this study were all part Hawaiian and connected to that heritage during school and at home. How did culture affect their interactions, such as the use of kinship terms and negotiation of individual autonomy and group affiliation? Further research is needed to shed more light on the particular issues related to cultural identity.

In his study of high school students, Ludlam (1992) surmised that the importance of their social interactions may have been related to the non-academic motivations of the vocational students. However, the students in this study who were concerned with and usually enjoyed academic work also emphasized the importance of "socializing." This factor

calls into question the notion that students with less academic ability or interest in school tend to participate more readily in off-task talk. Further research is needed to address this issue.

The focus group of this study was mixed gender, but issues related to gender were not an emphasis of the study. Of the four students, one boy and one girl tended to be more vocal; Kaipo and Leilani never seemed to be at a loss for words, both were opinionated and the two saw each other as worthy verbal adversaries. On the other hand Pono and Malia tended to be more low-key participants in the peer group. These descriptions of the interaction styles of the students negate prototypes of gendered identity. My data aligned more closely with Tannen (1990, 1991, 1994) and Goodwin (1990) who found gender differences to be situation specific rather than generalizations. The study of same gender groups, either all boys or all girls, would allow for the comparison and identification of dynamics that are influenced by the make-up of the group. Research of gender issues in classroom interactions would contribute another perspective to the research of Tannen and Goodwin in out-of-school contexts.

The teacher's perspective of student conversations would contribute an interesting dimension to the study of face-to-face interactions in the classroom. Differences in what the teacher thinks is going on and the events that are actually unfolding in peer group conversations have been researched to

a limited degree, from the perspective of either the teacher or the students. A study of the duality of this phenomenon across one classroom is needed to more clearly identify the range of dynamics that influence classroom discourse.

c. Different Activities

Comparing out-of-school interactions with in-school interactions would provide a cross-contextual study of the same peer group. Studies tend to concentrate on one aspect or the other (such as Goodwin, 1990; Willett, Wilson Keenan & Solsken, 1994); or both in more general terms (such as Heath, 1983).

d. Changes Over Time

A focus on changes in group dynamics over time would concern the evolutionary process of becoming a group described by Leilani, Malia, Kaipo, and Pono in individual and group interviews. Further study of specific transcripts that reveal changes in group dynamics and interactional involvement is needed to better understand the development of collective identity and how individual autonomy works into the equation.

C. Conclusion

Classroom communication occurs at three overlapping levels of interaction: the teacher-class level; teacher-student level; and student-student or peer group level (Bloome & Theodorou, 1988). This dissertation focused on peer group conversations for the purpose of investigating what was being accomplished in the face-to-face interactions.

The significance of the study relates to the value of "socializing" or off-task talk in relation to academic accomplishments such as "doing English." The data showed that social interactions or off-task conversations functioned to foster collective group identity, promote more in-depth academic engagement, facilitate conflict resolution, and further develop the social and personal identities of the peer group members. These findings, which acknowledged the student participants as observer/analysts of their face-to-face interactions, contribute another level to the theoretical understanding of what is learned in school. Further research is needed to examine how closely perceptions of students, teachers, and researchers correlate. What are the similarities? And what messages are inherent in the differences? By exploring these issues educators can develop broader understandings of what students have the opportunity to learn in peer group interactions as they are complex communicative events.

1. The Hawaiian Community Research Project also called The Nanakuli Project was the five year anthropological and psychological study that preceded KEEP. See Gallimore, R. & Howard, A., (Eds.) *Studies in a Hawaiian Community: Na Makamaka O Nanakuli* and Occasional Paper #1 for further descriptions of cultural studies of contemporary Hawaiian culture and behavior that evolved from the project.

2. Numerous studies, articles, chapters, and occasional papers have been written on various aspects of the Kamehameha Early Education Program. "Tell me about KEEP!" an interview with Roland Tharp, Principal Investigator (1982) provides an overview of the project.

3. The names of all participants in this study, teacher and students, were changed to protect their anonymity. Mrs. Smith was the pseudonym given to the Caucasian teacher.

4. Hawaiian pseudonyms were used for the student participants who were all of part-Hawaiian ancestry.

5. The term part-Hawaiian refers to the description used by Jordon, C., Au, K.H. & Joesting, A.K. (1983, p. 218) "to designate people descended in part from the original Polynesian inhabitants of the Hawaiian islands and who today participate in a modern Hawaiian sub-culture."

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPT #1 - MARCH 3

APPENDIX A

Transcript #1 - March 3

March 3 - TOPIC #1 - Plot Line

001 Pono: I think it's
002 like this,
003 it goes (writes)
004 something like that
005 because
006 when he's like this
007 when he's like this
008 (clasps his hands behind his head)
009 then the snake goes in the water
010 or something
011 Kaipo: So actually it' ll go down.
012 Malia: [And then he gets scared.
013 Pono: [Yeah
014 but
015 what about the heel?
016 Kaipo: That' s the one that
017 Pono: Snake by B.D' s heel
018 (Quietly writing)
019 Leilani: (Looks at Pono' s paper) Huh?
020 Kaipo: Snake by B.D.' s heel.

021 Pono: And the one,

022 you know the one

023 where he chops things up?

024 Malia: Here?

025 Leilani: Where?

026 Kaipo: If you think that's gonna be another point.

027 You're gonna hafta put another,

028 another point.

029 We can go down and up.

030 Leilani: (Writing) Eerrrrrrrrrrrrrr

031 Kaipo: Try go down and up,

032 right there.

033 All: (Write for about three seconds.)

034 Pono: Then you can erase it r-

035 right?

036 Kaipo: Not me.

037 Leilani: What are we doing?

038 We gotta all have the same thing.

039 Pono: (To Kaipo) You should put S by B. D.

040 Kaipo: So I don't care

041 Leilani: Let'm go.

042 Let'm go.

043 We just go like this then? (Points)

044 And then where?

045 Pono: (Turns, asks for assistance off camera)

046 Malia: (Looks at Leilani's paper)
047 Wait a minute
048 this is the high point
049 [when you
050 Pono: [Because when he goes like that,
051 (puts hands clasped behind head)
052 and then goes into the water,
053 then they're going to kill him again.
054 M & L: ((Talk among selves inaudibly.))
055 Pono: (To Leilani) So wouldn't you go like this?
056 Malia: No.
057 Because,
058 you know like right here?
059 He's holding up the hoe
060 and cuts him in half?
061 Leilani: Yeah.
062 Malia: Then he's relieved and he comes down.
063 Leilani: It goes up,
064 down,
065 up down,
066 yeah?
067 (To Pono) Right?
068 Kaipo: Yup.
069 Straight by where?
070 Leilani: Go like this then.
071 [(Points to Leilani's paper)

072 Malia: [No.

073 What are these?

074 Leilani: This is when he first cuts him.

075 Then he's relieved.

076 Right?

077 Malia: [Um h-m-m.

078 Leilani: [And then he comes back up.

079 Pono: And then the snake goes into the water.

080 Leilani: And then the snake comes back alive,

081 [and then

082 Kaipo: [The snakes' s still alive.

083 Leilani: Yeah.

084 Kaipo: The nerves,

085 in the snake

086 Pono: Okay.

087 How does it go?

088 Leilani: Okay,

089 [here.

090 Pono: [I don't know.

091 (Pono looks at Kaipo's paper)

092 Leilani: Over here

093 You can put ((Inaudible))

094 Malia: Then he's ready.

095 Pono: (Raises hand & calls for teacher)

096 [Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Smith.

097 Kaipo: [Do it yourself (to Pono)

098 Do it yourself (As the teacher walks over)

099 Kaipo: (To Mrs. Smith) What if we have three
climax points?
100 Teacher: Then you argue it through.
101 It's not three climax points.
102 It's one point at which you can all say
103 Yeah,
104 Everything after that's all downhill
105 to the finish line.
106 Okay?
107 Leilani: Yeah.
108 Teacher: Okay
109 So what do you think it might be?
110 Malia: When the snakes falls
111 Teacher: And what's your reason for that?
112 You could find that point here
113 and you could check to see.
114 Does the very next sentence give you relief?
115 Or the next paragraph
116 give you relief?
117 All: (Look through book.)
118 Pono: That
119 That to the opposite bank.
120 Teacher: Okay
121 You're saying this point's the high point
122 and everything after that
123 (Reads)"The snake was lying at my naked heel".
124 Okay?

You're saying that the next thing that happens
gives you relief?
You think he's safe?
Malia: [When he jumps up
Leilani: [When he
well over here,
when he struck
his head.
When hitting the sand
Where his heel had been an instant before.
Teacher: Okay,
so maybe you think
it's not when it's by his heel,
but
[when he strikes.
Pono: [Yeah.
Teacher: Okay,
then read on.
Does the next thing give you relief?
Are you sure at that point?
So check that through,
and argue with your team.
Do you think the very next thing?
Do you go?
Oh okay.
He's home free.
He's still trying to keep you wondering right?

152 Malia: I know, right here.

153 [Where he's gonna

154 Leilani: [Yeah.

155 Pono: What do we write? (Erases)

156 Malia: I think

157 thinking that he was gonna fall back on it.

158 He was gonna fall back.

159 [On top of the

160 Leilani: [No

161 when he grabbed the

162 [hoe.

163 Malia: [Yeah, I guess so.

164 Leilani: So what do you put down?

165 All: (Erasing)

166 Kaipo: What is it?

167 [What is it?

168 Leilani: [That he was going to fall back on it

169 when he fell on the bank.

170 Pono: Okay B.D.

171 All: Writing)

172 Leilani: Just put B. D.

173 B.D. on the bank.

174 Kaipo: [B.D. fall on snake.

175 Malia: [B.D. thinking of falling on snake.

176 Pono: [Oh.

177 Okay.

178 So we have three climaxes then?

179 Malia: Well,
180 the one right before it,
181 the one right before it was.
182 [He was by his head, yeah?
183 Pono: [Yeah the next one.
184 He went by his head
185 Malia: Right before it.
186 Leilani: [Right before it
187 Kaipo: [But wait
188 Didn't you just say
189 you wanted the climax
190 for when he looks back
191 [and he seen that the snake is bloody
192 Pono: [His tail
193 Kaipo: [He got out
194 an instant before
195 he snake striked?
196 Pono: Stroke
197 Kaipo: [Struck
198 Pono: [Struck
199 Malia: No.
200 But then after that.
201 There's still
202 [um
203 Leilani: [No
204 I think he means.
205 (to Kaipo) You mean the rising action?

206 Kaipo: You know.

207 [When he jumps.

208 Leilani: [Oo-oh yeah.

209 Kaipo: So this

210 He' s thinking of the same thing.

211 [The same thing

212 Malia: [No cuz

213 Leilani: Ya know,

214 over here. (points to her paper)

215 We could put (writes) S. dies.

216 [Right here.

217 Kaipo: [Let me see yours.

218 (Kaipo takes Leilani's paper and reads it.)

219 Pono: And then,

220 he does the hoe.

221 [The hoe is towards the top.

222 Kaipo: [And then he

223 The climax is

224 he's think that

225 he's thinking that

226 he'll fall on the snake.

227 Yeah?

228 All: (Writing)

229 Malia: And what

230 (Looks at Leilani's paper)

231 All: (Writing)

232 Leilani: B.D. What?

233 Pono: B.D. kills S.

234 Malia: And then he gets relief that he's killed.

235 Yeah?

236 [Then he's got

237 Kaipo: [So shouldn't you be putting

238 B. D. holding hoe

239 just before that point?

240 And then over there is

241 Pono: [But

242 Kaipo: [Then the image is,

243 the top part is that

244 he thought he killed it.

245 [And then when he

246 Pono: [Wait

247 Kaipo: No

248 It's

249 [You guys.

250 Malia: [Over here

251 over here after he comes down.

252 He thinks he killed it already.

253 And then he gets

254 Then its up again

255 [Cuz the thing's right by him.

256 Leilani: [We're skippin some parts.

257 Pono: B.D.

258 B. D.'s relieved.

259 Cuz he thought he killed the snake.

March 3 - TOPIC #2 - Timing

260 Teacher: (Off screen) We're down to the last three minutes guys.

261 M & L: Hoo-o-o-o!

262 Teacher: (Off screen) Time flies when you're having fun.

263 Right guys?

264 No, I'll extend it.

265 I can see you guys are still thinking about it.

March 3 - TOPIC #3 - Plot Line

266 Leilani: But

267 [but we skipped some things.

268 Kaipo: [So go like this.

269 You know like

270 right here

271 Leilani: How come you guys

272 came from the heel to the hoe part?

273 Kaipo: [No put

274 Pono: [We're going backwards

275 Kaipo: No

276 Put the heel

277 Put the heel

278 on the second part.

279 Leilani: [But

280 Kaipo: [No

put the heel,

put the heel on the second point.

Malia: The heel is after

when he's holding the hoe.

Kaipo: [He's holding the hoe and

Leilani: [No-o-o-o

Kaipo: He chops it in half,

but only

[the head is behind him

Leilani: [The heel

Pono: [No, look

The bottom down.

The bottom is relief.

Malia: Yeah

He' s thinking he got away.

And then he goes up again.

And then he's right by the heel.

March 3 - TOPIC #4 - Disagreement

All: (Get very quiet)

Kaipo: (To Leilani) Argue.

Tell us what you want.

Leilani: Never mind!

You

You guys just don' t understand me!

Kaipo: Wha-at

Wha-a-a-at

306 All: (Very QUIET, look around, then
look at books

March 3 - TOPIC #5 - Plot Line

307 Pono: Right
308 Right here we are
309 ((Reads inaudibly))
310 Kaipo: Okay
311 But look
312 Over here
313 He tries
314 He knows it's not dead.
315 He knows it's not dead
316 so he's trying
317 to escape up the water.
318 To bring up the snake
319 [on land and
320 Pono: [Yeah.
321 Kaipo: [and try
322 And finish the job.
323 Pono: [This thing is weird.
324 Kaipo: [Okay.
325 [The next thing is
326 Pono: [So it keeps on going
327 Then.
328 It doesn't go down,
329 it keeps on going (erasing).

330 Then it goes to

331 and then it goes down

332 and that

333 an'

334 (Pono's voice fades out, they all continue to write for about 6 seconds)

335 Pono: Okay

336 It's here. (Reads his paper)

337 B.D. holds it to the end

338 going back to the sandbar

339 B. D. back

340 to sandbar

341 to finish.

342 Kaipo: Huh?

343 Pono: Yeah?

344 What did you say then?

345 Leilani: [B. D. breaking the

346 Pono: [B.D. went to sandbar.

347 To finish.

348 Kaipo: B.D.

349 B. D. jumps in water

350 Jumps onto sandbar

351 To finish the job.

352 To finish killing the snake.

353 Pono: Does that look good?

March 3 - TOPIC #6 - Disagreement

354 Leilani: I DON' T CARE!

355 All: (Get very QUIET again.)

356 Pono: We're not getting anything accomplished here people!

357 Think.

358 Now think!

359 Kaipo: Big words.

360 Pono: I got

361 No

362 We gotta

363 We gotta argue it out an'

364 All have the same thing.

365 So when she collects it

366 We all can have the same thing.

367 All (Get very quiet again)

March 3 - TOPIC #7 - Plot Line

368 Pono: B.D. on sandbar.

369 [Put X on

370 Leilani: [Where does this go?

371 Malia: Between the ((Inaudible))

372 and the land.

373 All: (Write)

374 Leilani: What?

375 Pono: B. D. on sandbar

376 Finish

377 All: (Write quietly)

378 Kaipo: Hold on.

379 [We should be doing

380 Pono: [Okay.

381 After B.D. sees S,

382 B.D. stops.

383 After B.D's at

384 (Pause)

385 B.D. sees S.

386 B.D. runs to get hoe.

387 Yeah?

388 Leilani: What?

389 Pono: B. D. runs to get hoe after B. D. sees S.

390 (Points to her paper)

391 [Sees S and

392 Leilani: [Right there?

393 What's next?

394 (Kaipo writes, Malia watches Pono & Leilani then does some writing)

395 Pono: (Yawning) B.D. goes running

396 and gets the hoe.

397 Kaipo: Huh?

398 Pono: So here

399 ((Reads inaudibly))

400 Kaipo: You're in the beginning of the story.

401 Malia: Cuz we need to start over.

402 Kaipo: Oh (Starts writing)

403 seeing the snake,

404 with there?

405 Malia: Yeah

406 (For the next six seconds, Kaipo is writing, Leilani is reading, Malia is staring off to the side, and Pono has his read leaning on his hands.)

407 Malia: Where's that go? (Starts writing)

408 Pono: B. D.

409 (Pause)

410 B. D. what (Looks at Leilani)

411 B. D. ran

412 to get hoe

413 Malia: Runs for hoe

414 Runs

March 3 - TOPIC #8 - Format of Paper

415 All: (Writing)

416 Leilani: Do you hafta skip lines?

417 Pono: Oh

418 No.

419 Malia: Only if you want to.

March 3 - TOPIC #9 - Plot Line

420 Pono: B. D.

421 (Pause) B.D.

422 Is B. D. ((Inaudible))?

423 Malia: Right after he gets the hoe
424 It goes all the way to
425 holding the hoe
426 [and killing
427 Pono: [I
428 I
429 I ran across and got it.
430 and got it
431 (Leilani reads silently, Malia watches Kaipo writing, while Pono is reading out loud.)
432 (Teacher walks into view in background, observing)
433 Pono: What?
434 Okay
435 Malia: I was wondering
436 if that happened before the climax.
437 (Next 6 seconds, Kaipo is writing, Pono and Malia are staring, Leilani is reading her book silently. Malia reaches for her book and starts reading, another 5 second pause)
438 Leilani: What should I put now?
439 Malia: I think that's all.
440 Right after he gets the hoe.
441 He's throwing it,
442 to kill him

March 3 - TOPIC #10 - Disagreement

443 Leilani: (Loud sigh)

444 All : (Get very QUIET)

445 Pono: O-o-oh

446 We argue too much!

March 3 - TOPIC # 11 - Pono's Dropped Pencil

447 Pono: (Pushes his chair back & starts to crawl under desk, bangs his head on the desk.)

448 Ouch! (Laughs)

449 Kaipo: What did you DO?

450 (Laughs)

451 Pono: (Bends down under his desk again)

March 3 - TOPIC #12 - Other Classes

452 Kaipo: (To Malia) You have health?

453 Malia: (Nods to indicate 'yes')

454 Kaipo: What'd we do today?

455 Malia: Correct the guidelines.

456 Leilani: We have heath last.

457 Pono: (Brings his head back up above the desk.)

458 Pono: I had health first.

459 (All get very QUIET again, Kaipo writes, Leilani twirls her necklace, Pono and Kaipo watch others.)

March 3 - TOPIC #13 - Time Limit

460 Kaipo: (Sees the teacher watching them off screen)
Uh-oh.

461 (Slaps his paper) That's it.

462 Teacher: (Off screen) That' s five.

463 How close are you?

464 Pono: [Not even!

465 Leilani: [Not even!

466 Teacher: Okay three more minutes

467 Malia: Five.

468 Leilani: How we gonna finish?

469 Pono: Okay

470 Read! Read!

471 Think! Think!

472 Read! Read!

473 Think! Think

March 3 - TOPIC #14 - Plot Line

474 Kaipo: (Reads) So then

475 [he hesitated.

476 Pono: [Get um

477 B. D. hesitated hesitated,

478 Where it says right here,

479 He relied upon the beautiful?

480 Leilani: This is after!

481 You know we' re doing the falling point!

481 Pono: Oh.

483 Right here.

484 Oh

485 [Uum

486 Malia: [Falling action

487 u-um

488 slides into the water

489 Pono: B. D. knows

490 the snake is dead.

491 Leilani: The snake slides off

492 into the muddy water

493 All: (Write for about 6 seconds)

494 Pono: Now

495 after B D. runs

496 for a hoe

497 B.D.

498 B. D. hesitated.

499 Leilani: We're arguing.

500 Pono: All right

501 It says it

502 [right here

503 Leilani: [That's before!

504 We're over here now,

505 we're finished doing the climax!

506 All: (Write silently)

507 Pono: Okay

508 No, no,

509 no, no, no.

510 All: (Write silently)

511 Pono: Jumps into water

512 Leilani: Flying up the bank

513 Pono: Jumps into water.

514 [Right here.

515 [(Turns his paper to show Leilani)

516 The first jumped into water.

517 No,

518 no,

519 [what was it?

520 Leilani: [Climb up the bank.

521 Malia: Climb up bank.

522 Pono: [Climb up bank.

523 Malia: [B. D. climbs up bank.

524 Pono: B. D. climbs up bank.

525 All: (Start writing)

526 Pono: And then,

527 when he's sitting there,

528 ((Inaudible))

529 Malia: (Reads from her paper) "I knew

530 he was dying in shallow water"

531 (pause)

532 Then I managed to climb up the bank

533 until I sat solving this mystery.

534 P & M: (Read from book inaudibly)

535 Pono: Thinking that maybe

536 he could die.

537 Thinking that maybe he could die.

538 (Looks over at Leilani's writing)

539 Malia: Where?

540 Pono: Here,

541 it says

542 right here.

543 (Reads) "For the first time in my life,

544 I thought about death.

545 Knowing that I too could die."

546 Leilani: What about when he

547 [What about

March 3 - TOPIC #15 - Timing

548 Teacher: (off screen) I'm going to give you three more minutes.

549 This group's got a good discussion going,

550 and I've got to listen.

551 All: (Listens to the teacher.)

March 3 - TOPIC #16 - Plot Line

552 Leilani: What about when

553 when he looks around

554 and the snake is still there?

555 Pono: Huh?

556 Leilani: Right after he thinks about death
557 [Thinks about
558 Pono: [It was B. D.
559 [The man could still ((Inaudible))
560 Leilani: [that he was still there
561 and the world was still with him.
562 Malia: We know that the snake is dead.
563 Pono: We know its dead.
564 (All write; Pono turns and looks at the clock)
565 Kaipo: (gesturing at Pono's paper)
566 I think
567 I think
568 he thought about death before.
569 Pono: It's right before it
570 I think.
571 Leilani: Right here. (Pono turns to look)
572 Pono: Right before he was going to get the hoe.
573 Teacher: (Walks by) What about that?
574 (Pono gets up to go around Leilani)
575 M & L: We were just
576 thinking about that.
577 Teacher: Oh,
578 you don't have to write that.
579 That's not an event.
580 Now,
581 chunk the paragraphs.

582 (Pono returns to his seat, all start writing)
583 He's just thinking,
584 right?
585 About what to do.
586 So nothing really big's happening,
587 unless you wanna say,
588 you know,
589 he thinks about whether to kill him
590 or not.
591 You could say that.
592 He thinks about whether or not to kill.
593 Then what's the next thing he does?
594 Malia: Goes and gets the hoe?
595 Teacher: Right.
596 Right.
597 Gets the hoe.
598 What's the next paragraph?
599 Pono: He worked
600 He worked to get into position
601 to kill the snake.
602 Right?
603 Right?
604 And to go like that,
605 [so
606 Teacher: [But then what happened?
607 [After he got
608 Pono: [He hesitated.

609 Teacher: Right.

610 Okay.

611 So,

612 go sort of like

613 one or two paragraphs at a chunk

614 and see what happens (leaves).

615 Pono: Okay.

616 So,

617 he gets a hoe.

618 B.D. gets into position.

619 Leilani: (Flips through pages, then all are writing.)

620 Malia: Oh,

621 I don't think

622 I don't think this would be what he thinks

623 What he thinks about this

624 because she said

625 only things that happen.

626 (Writes)

627 Pono: Okay

628 [The other one

629 Malia: [But after he hesitated

630 Pono: Okay.

631 Um

632 (Writes)

633 As um

634 He

635 hesitated

636 One more minute.

637 One more minute

638 Teacher: (Off screen) Okay, you guys ready?

639 Pono: The last two,

640 goes

641 (Reads) "I never again

642 would I take life for granted."

643 Malia: She said not to put down what he's thinking!

644 Only what happened!

645 Pono: I know!

March 3 - TOPIC# 17 - Counting Action Points

646 K & L: (Count plot points inaudibly)

647 Leilani: Four.

648 Four!

649 Pono: Five, six, seven.

650 Seven!

651 Leilani: That's the climax!

652 Pono: Eight.

653 Eight.

March 3 - TOPIC # 18 - Kaipo Doing Own Thing

654 Kaipo: As you guys've been going along

655 Have you guys noticed

656 That as you guys were going along

657 I never said anything

658 and

659 I have things different

660 from you guys?

661 Pono: (Takes Kaipo's paper and reads it)

662 What?

663 What' d you do?

664 Kaipo: (Laughs)

665 M & L: (Count rising actions)

666 Pono: (Shows Kaipo's paper to Leilani and Malia,)

667 He said different stuff

668 than us.

669 Malia: How come you did different stuff?

670 Kaipo: I don't know.

671 Because

672 I'm not a summary person.

673 I write more specific things.

674 (Leilani reads Kaipo's paper, Pono counts paragraphs up to the number 8.)

675 Leilani: You're not supposed to write specific things!

676 Kaipo: Mine doesn't make sense anyway

March 3 - TOPIC #19 - Counting Action Points

677 Leilani: Don' t count the climax.

678 Teacher: (off screen) Seven and three from table two.

679 One climax and three ((Inaudible))

680 Kaipo: We had three climaxes.

681 No

682 Two

683 Pono: We have

684 One fall.

685 Seven

686 One

687 and two

688 Leilani: Seven

689 One

690 And three-e-e.

691 Pono: We got one fall.

692 Leilani: We already got that.

693 One

694 Two

695 Three-e-e (pointing to the book page)

696 That's rising action!

697 Kaipo: What was the other?

698 Pono: (to Leilani) Oo-o-oh-h!

699 Malia: This is seven (pointing)

700 You see?

701 Seven

702 and three.

703 Kaipo: Why do we need ((Inaudible))?

704 Never mind

705 Pono: So

706 it goes (pointing at Leilani's sheet)

707 [one, two, three, four

708 Malia: [Five, six, seven.

709 This is the climax.

710 Leilani: ((Inaudible))

711 Malia: One, two, three

712 Leilani: Okay (starts writing)

713 The climax is itself.

714 There's only one climax.

715 Kaipo: (Writing again)

716 Pono: How did you guys get three?

717 Leilani: Loo-o-ok!

718 One,

719 two,

720 three.

721 Yo-ou didn't put one!

722 Did you put this?

723 The snake falls into the muddy water?

724 Teacher: (Off screen) Table 3,

725 Okay, what do you have?

726 L, M & K: Seven and three

727 Teacher: ((Inaudible))

728 Malia: (Responding to another table's total) Eight

729 and

730 two and a half?

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPT #2 - MARCH 11

Transcript #2 - March 11

XXX Teacher: You all have some positions?

Okay

Will you read your positions around the group.

How ever many of these you have.

March 11 - Topic #1- Sharing Responses

001 Malia : Wanna start?

002 Kaipo: No

003 You go first.

004 Malia: I wouldn't have done the same thing because

005 Okay

006 We don't want to arrest him there

007 because he' s my friend.

008 I haven't seen him in ten years.

009 And he came all this way just to see me.

010 ((Inaudible))

011 Pono: If I were involved,

012 I would of called a police.

013 He would probably have ran.

014 That's not real

015 Kaipo: I would have arrested Bobby.
016 Because he could have um
017 Bring
018 Bring
019 Bring trouble to this town.
020 Even though he's my friend,
021 I have to do my job.
022 You never know what he could have done here.
023 But I was shocked.
024 How could my best friend have
025 have turned out to be a criminal?
026 Leilani: My turn.
027 Okay.
028 Jimmy Wells,
029 I would have done exactly like he did.
030 The only reason I would do it like that is
031 because if that was my best friend,
032 I wouldn't have the guts to arrest him.
033 So I'd let another man do the job.
034 I don't have the guys to,
035 Oh,
036 I already said that.
037 My only question is why?
038 Why would my best friend,
039 after all these years
040 do something like that?

March 11 - TOPIC UNIT #2 - New Scenario

041 Kaipo: You

042 You said yeah?

043 [You didn't hear that whole question.

044 Malia: [Would you arrest him right there

045 while you were talking to him

046 [or

047 Kaipo: [No

048 I didn't write about that.

049 Okay.

050 (To Leilani) I told you,

051 Well would you go

052 Would you go up and arrest Pono?

053 You go 'yeah'

054 Leilani: (Points her pencil at Kaipo)

055 No

056 You ding dong. (Kaipo laughs)

057 I wouldn't do that to Pono.

058 (Hugs Pono)

059 But Pono wouldn't become a criminal!

060 Kaipo: But Pono would've arrested YOU!

061 Pono: I wouldn't become a criminal!

062 Kaipo: H-h-yeah!

063 Well

March 11 - TOPIC #3 - Queen Elizabeth

064 All: (Laugh as Leilani throws pencil at Kaipo.)

065 Kaipo: Yes, Queen Elizabeth!

066 (Laughter)

067 I remember that,

068 Always thought I was ((Inaudible))

069 She did a cartwheel and fell down

070 Malia: (Getting up from chair)

Cartwheel downstairs?

071 Kaipo: No

072 No it was flat.

073 Leilani: I was on the level part.

074 Pono: With a bag on (meaning backpack)

075 and everything?

076 Leilani: No

077 I slipped because my shoes were wet.

March 11 - TOPIC #4 - New Scenario

078 Kaipo: Pono (pointing at him)

079 No

080 Put it this way.

081 There's nobody around

082 Absolutely nobody around you

083 Right?

084 Twenty years from now.

085 We know Kapua's the murderer

086 We arrest her

087 Cuz there's nobody there to do the job.

088 Pono: ((Inaudible))

089 Leilani: [I didn't murder anybody!

090 Kaipo: [I said

091 Keku was a murderer.

092 Teacher: Are we fighting here children?

093 Leilani: No

094 He's just taking it from a different angle

095 Teacher: That's okay.

096 Leilani: [I know but...

097 Kaipo: [But she misunderstood me

098 She thought I said HER.

099 Leilani: I thought he said

100 if you had murdered somebody

101 would you arrest her?

102 I said

103 I'm not going to be a murderer!

104 Kaipo: But I didn't say her name.

105 Leilani: (Sarcastic) My mistake (Laughs)

106 I'm sorry (Laughs)

107 Kaipo: (Sarcastic) You better be.

108 (Laughs)

109 Teacher: Okay

110 Let's get a few opinions here

111 and get them in class,

112 okay?

113 Kaipo: Not mine.

114 Teacher: (In background) Were there differing opinions
115 at your table?
116 You're even.
117 Okay?
118 Let's take a sample
119 Leilani: (To Kaipo) You were different.
120 Teacher: Who were you for?
121 Kaipo: Who, me?
122 I meant,
123 I wouldn't have done the same thing.
124 I just ((Inaudible)).
125 Pono: You were
126 U-uh
127 What do you think of?
128 Kaipo: Not me.
129 Teacher: Okay
130 We'll hear one,
131 and if you all agree with her position
132 then.
133 Okay Leah and Reno will read
134 and then we'll take one.

APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPT #3 - MARCH 18

Transcript #3 - March 18

March 18 - TOPIC #1 - Other Class: Math

001 Pono: Do you have?

002 I got to do this myself?

003 Kaipo: Look (Leans over to help Pono)

004 [no no

005 Pono: [No

006 I know!

007 Thirty,

008 thirty,

009 forty.

010 Kaipo: Forty plus thirty equals what?

011 Pono: Seventy minutes

012 sixty two,

013 that equals

014 Leilani: That's gross

(To Malia playing with rubber cement.)

015 O-o-oh-h!

016 Pono: Seventy one

017 plus thirteen

018 Kaipo: Wait

019 Look at this

020 Pono: Eighty one plus three equals eighty four.

021 Kaipo: Wait

022 Three,

023 that's ten, eleven, twel-

024 Pono: Wait

025 This is thirty.

026 Right?

027 Seven plus three equals ten so

028 Kaipo: Wait, wait .

029 Listen, listen.

030 Lis-s-teen.

031 Pono: Or you add all this here.

032 Kaipo: Fifty eight.

033 Pono: Sixty seven.

034 Kaipo: Plus ten,

035 that's seventy,

036 ninety.

037 Pono: Huh?

038 Wait.

039 Forty right here,

040 right?

041 Kaipo: Okay.

042 Look

043 Ten

044 Pono: Wait

045 Go here

046 Ten

047 Kaipo: Going once,

048 [nine, ten,

049 Leilani: [What the hell are you guys doin?

(To Kaipo and Pono as they get very loud.)

050 Kaipo: [Twelve.

051 Malia: They' re tryin ta count .

052 Pono: This is twelve.

053 Kaipo: Nine, nineteen, twelve.

054 Leilani: [(To Malia) You wanna count too? (Both laugh)

055 Pono: [That's not twelve.

056 Malia: No wait,

057 they're trying ta do it by themselves.

058 M & L: (Laugh)

059 Kaipo: Twelve, nineteen,

060 twelve, nineteen.

061 Quiet (to M & L)

062 M & L: (Laugh)

063 Twenty-six

064 Twenty-nine

065 No that's not

066 Oh

067 Nine

068 Pono: Oh

069 come on come on

070 Kaipo: One two three four five six seven

071 Wait

072 Now I'm

073 Now I know.

074 Pono: Okay now thirteen plus,

075 No wait

076 I want to do it by myself!

077 Kaipo: (Reaching for calculator) Alright already

078 Pono: Wait.

079 22 + 28 = 40 Right?

080 40 + 40 that's 80

081 That's 80

082 (Malia leans over to see Pono's paper)

083 That's 80

084 Wait wait wait wait wait

085 That's 22

086 22 right there

087 Kaipo: I was right, it's ninety!

088 Malia: It's ninety

089 Pono: Oh.

090 Malia: O-o-o-ah

091 (Sighs & sits back down)

092 Kaipo: I WAS right!

093 Pono: DON'T TELL me!

094 Okay?

095 Leilani: 'Ipo

096 You-u-u guys

097 Po-o-ono

098 Pono: Oh

099 Hug

100 P & L: (Embrace)

March 18 - TOPIC #2 - Vocabulary Posters

101 Pono: What do you think is best?

102 Kaipo: Boy you bring back memories

(To Malia who is rubbing rubber cement off her hands)

103 M & L: (Laugh)

104 Leilani: When I was sick,

105 I missed English the most

106 Pono: This is my,

107 my,

108 my picture.

109 Leilani: (To Malia) See anything in my eye?

110 Malia: No (laughs)

111 Leilani: Duh!

112 Kaipo: (To someone off camera) Who's gonna?

113 You know that problem, yeah?

114 What if you haven't read the whole

115 I know the problem,

116 but what if you haven't read the whole book?

117 To know what they did about the problem?

March 18 - TOPIC #3 - Contact Lenses

118 Pono: What is that?

119 Malia: Take out what?

120 Pono: Take out your lens

(Leilani is taking out her lens)

121 Kaipo: Are they soft lenses?

122 Are they soft lenses or glass?

(Watches Leilani check over her contact lens)

123 I was gonna wear them this year but I didn't want to.

124 Malia: Why didn't you?

125 Kaipo: Didn't want to.

126 Malia: Wear 'um next year.

127 Kaipo: I don't know, I might

(as Leilani's putting the lens back in)

128 And if it's inside out it hurts so much

129 If you have the contact lens inside out or if you have it on the wrong eye.

130 I wonder if the

131 the glass are better

132 cuz they're not soft but they're not hard either.

133 They're like softer.

134 Hard ones hurt your eyes and soft ones

135 soft ones

136 if you don't have 'em the right way

137 they're itchy.

138 So if you get those ones

139 you don't have to ((Inaudible)).

140 Malia: I know ((Inaudible)).

141 (Laughs)

142 Kaipo: Because I quit my other ((Inaudible)).

143 (Laughs)

March 18 - TOPIC #4 - Pencils

144 Leilani: No!

145 That's two!

146 Do you know people are stealing my pencils

left and right!

147 Pono: That wasn't me.

148 Kaipo: Up or down

149 Leilani: I need a pencil

150 Kaipo: Alright

151 What about up or down?

152 Malia: Here, how do you spell ((Inaudible))?

153 Leilani: No,

154 I already have a pen

155 I need a pencil.

156 Kaipo: What about stealing it up and down?

March 18 - TOPIC #5 - Vocabulary Posters

157 Pono: How do you spell ((Inaudible))?

158 Leilani: [(Laughing) Gotta sharpen.

159 Kaipo: [(Laughs)

160 Try go sharpen those pencils

161 Leilani: (Laughs & goes to pencil sharpener)

162 Malia: How much is this poster worth?

163 How much points?

164 Kaipo: What would you do to improve this?

165 Is anybody listening?

166 Is anybody listening is anybody listening?

167 Pono: Guess not.

168 Kaipo: No

169 I guess not

(Leilani returns)

170 Kaipo: Here Leilani

171 Give

172 Give

173 Let me see

174 Let me see the pencil.

175 Leilani: (Shakes her head "no" and walks to the other side of the table)

176 Kaipo: Let me have the pencil

177 That will sharpen it

178 Leilani: I was gonna use it.

179 Kaipo: (Uses small pencil sharpener)

180 I hate these dumb things

181 Leilani: (Returns) Do you like my color?

182 Malia: Oo-o-oh (Responding to bright orange paper.)

183 Kaipo: (Seeing paper) Shoo-o-o-oo!

184 Malia: My my my!

March 18 - TOPIC #6 - MTV

185 Leilani: I watched MTV all day yesterday!

186 L & M: (Talk inaudibly)

187 Kaipo: (To Leilani) Duh duh duh!

March 18 - Topic #7 - Eraser

188 Leilani: Whose eraser is this?

189 Kaipo: It was in there.

190 Leilani: I just wanted to know

191 (Kaipo drops a marker in the box)

192 Keep it?

193 (Laughs and takes the eraser)

194 Kaipo: I threw this in here.

195 I threw this in here.

196 Then you go throw it away.

197 Leilani: No-o-o!

198 Kaipo: You-u-u

199 Leilani: What is so hard about putting one leg in front of the other to the garbage can?

200 Kaipo: I have better things to do

201 Malia: Like?

202 L & M: (Laugh)

March 18 - TOPIC #8 - Clothes

203 Leilani: Hey, wanna see my shirt Malia?

204 (Shows Malia her shirt.)

205 Kaipo: Doesn't that remind you of somebody?

206 Malia: Not sure ((Inaudible)).

March 18 - TOPIC #9 - Materials

(Malia & Pono continue drawing, Leilani gets ready to draw, Kaipo gets items from book bag.)

207 Kaipo: People are stealing my pens left and right.

208 And up and down.

209 Pono: (Getting up from his chair.) You know?

210 You know what?

211 You know how much people are stealing my stuff?

212 Leilani: Sit down Pono

213 Sit down!

214 Pono: (Laughs, takes his papers to go off camera.)

March 18 - TOPIC #10 - Vocabulary Poster

215 Leilani: Can we type this at home?

216 Or does it like have to be on a certain paper?

217 Malia: Can type it home.

((Talks inaudibly w/Malia while laughing))

218 Kaipo: Nice yeah?

219 My

220 My lettering

221 Malia: Oo-o-oh-h! (Picks up poster.)

222 Kaipo: What?

223 Malia: Oh man it won't fit.

((Inaudible talk among group))

224 Kaipo: [It will, it will, it will.

225 Malia: [I know con-n-n-n-descending

(Pointing to her poster)

226 Descending

227 Can you read it?

228 All over here?

229 Oo-oh! I know, I know, I know, I know.

230 Condescending (points around corner of paper)

231 (Laughs) See?

232 Kaipo: ((Inaudible)) always writes lo-o-o-ong.

233 Malia: (To Leilani) Are you doin' a story?

234 Leilani: I did one paragraph.

235 Malia: I mean

236 Yeah,

237 Your paragraph was good,

238 But your story was sorta

239 Duh.

240 Leilani: What do you mean?

241 (Laughs)

242 I'm listening!

243 Malia: Is this gonna be a story?

244 Or is it gonna?

245 What's it all about?

246 [Is it a story?

247 Leilani: [It' s a story

248 L & M: [(Laugh)

249 Malia: Don' t sound like a beginning to me!

250 Sounds like a ending!

251 Leilani: (Laughing) 'Kay, listen!

252 (Reads) They looked at each other,

253 and they started to look up,

254 and the

255 and the moons orbited.

256 (Laughs)

257 Malia: The moons orbited.

258 Kaipo: Thank goodness I didn't have that word.

259 I would never have made something good.

260 Malia: I would brandish his head off (laughs)

261 Leilani: I would never have done that (laughs)

262 Kaipo: I would never done that (laughs)

263 Leilani: I don't like this,

264 It' s too

265 [intimate (laughs)

266 All: [(Laugh)

267 Leilani: (Flips hair over her head)

I need a rubber band.

268 Malia: (Laughing) Use your bracelet.

269 Leilani: Use my bracelet?

270 Malia: Yeah

271 It's short.

272 Give it a try(laughs).

273 Leilani: Hey guys!

274 Kaipo: What?

275 Leilani: Watch!

276 (All turn, Malia laughs, and Kaipo starts patting his hands on the desk in a rapid rhythm, laughing)

277 Leilani: Rrr-r--r-r-r-r-r--r-r-r-rr--r-r-r

278 d-d-d-d-d-d-d----bee-bee-bee-bee

279 Kaipo: Keep going, keep going.

280 Leilani: Rrrr-r--r-r-r-r-r--r-r-r-rr--r-r-r

281 d-d-d-d-d-d-d----bee-bee-bee-bee-bbiinngg

282 It falls out.

(Leilani comes back into view with her hair all up in a bun.)

283 Kaipo: Leilani

284 Leilani: Shut up!

285 You intimate brandish-head.

286 (All laugh. Malia gets up and walks off camera. Pono returns.)

287 Kaipo: I will brandish your intimate

288 I will brandish your intimate relations.

289 I would brandish your intimate relations with Dougie!

290 Leilani: Ee-e-uh!

291 In your dreams!

March 18 - TOPIC #11 - Pono's Girlfriend

292 Leilani: What?

293 What are you guys talking about?

294 Malia: Oh my word.

295 Leilani: Miss Smith (to teacher)

296 What?

297 Pono: She doesn't know

298 Leilani: What?

299 Pono: That we

300 [maybe I should

301 Leilani [What is she talking about?

March 18 - TOPIC #12 - Materials

302 Pono: Here hold my pencil

(Pono tosses his marker back into the box; it misses; Malia and the other girl return. Pono tosses another marker which gets knocked into a rapid roll, falls off the edge of the desk, bounces, and hits Leilani's leg. While this is happening, Pono gets up and walks around to the other side of Leilani's desk as the pen goes flying)

303 Leilani: Oo-o-oh!

304 Oooohhh!

305 Pono: What happened now?

306 Leilani: (Gasping) Something hit my leg!

307 Pono: A pen! (Picking it up)

308 Leilani: I knew that. (laughs)

(Pono returns to his desk)

3/18 - TOPIC #13 - Pono' Girlfriend

309 Leilani: What is she talkin' about you guys?

310 Pono: I don' t know

311 Leilani: (Laughs)

312 Pono: No no no no

313 I' m gonna break up.

314 Leilani: Why?

315 Pono: (Looks but does not respond.)

316 Leilani: Well if you're not doin with her

317 can I borrow your jacket?

318 Pono: (Takes off sweatshirt & gives it to Leilani)

319 It's hot anyway.

320 Leilani: I like this jacket.

321 (Pono laughs, Leilani puts on the sweatshirt.)

322 Pono: Yeah

March 18 - TOPIC #14 - K & L Kinship

323 All: (Laugh)

324 Kaipo: Ah she called you a her.

325 Pono: I' m her brother!

326 Malia: (Points to Pono) You're her cousin!

327 All: (Laugh)

March 18 - Topic #15 - Assignment

328 Pono: Um,

329 I can do my math yeah now?

330 Kaipo: No

331 Pono: Can I do my math?

332 If you're all finished?

333 Kaipo: Do your reading record.

334 Malia: Did you do your reading record?

335 Pono: No

336 Malia: Well do your reading record.

337 Leilani: But he doesn't want to.

338 Pono: Yeah!

339 Leilani: I can tell everything. (Pats Pono on back as he goes up to get binder)

340 I can read his mind.

341 We're twins can't you see?

342 We're born under the same moon.

343 Malia: So was everybody else.

344 (Laughs)

345 So what?

346 All: (Laugh)

347 Kaipo: You guys are lumps (laughs).

348 (Malia tosses a pen in the box just as Leilani brings her head up. Leilani gasps, Malia and Kaipo laugh. Pono returns.)

349 Pono: Everybody says ((Inaudible))

350 Leilani: (Flips through Pono's book.) These books are so-o good.

351 I didn't read the whole thing but ((Inaudible)).

352 (Leilani throws the book back on Pono' desk, Malia laughs, Kaipo writes)

353 Pono: It is.

354 Leilani: That one's soo-o-o good.

355 M & P: (Laugh)

356 Pono: I don't know wow!

357 Leilani: Somebody help me.

358 I don't know what to write.

359 Pono: (Looking through his notebook) Me either.

360 Leilani: Malia, you gotta help me.

361 I don't know what to write about.

362 Pono: Can write your reading record.

(Looks through his notebook.)

363 Malia: (Watching Leilani) Why are you erasing?

364 Leilani: Because I didn't like this.

365 Malia: Sorry

March 18 - TOPIC #16 - Activities

366 Leilani: ((Inaudible))

367 Malia: After study hall?

368 Locker room?

369 Pono: (Singing) We are the champions

370 and we are the champions

371 of the world.

372 All: (Laugh)

373 Kaipo: I hate that song!

374 Pono: (Sings) We are the champions

March 18 - TOPIC #17 - Classmates

375 K & M: What?

376 Kaipo: Who's that?

377 Leilani: ((Inaudible))

378 Kaipo: She looks just like her.

(Pointing to someone off camera.)

379 Leilani: Don't say that!

380 P & K: Yeah,

381 she does,

382 yeah,

383 she does.

384 Malia: [Pono used to like her, but

385 Pono: [(Sings) We are the champions,

386 Kaipo: You know who would look like sisters?

387 Malia, Maile and Kalii,

388 Momi.

389 Leilani: Who?

390 Malia: What would their last names be?

391 Kaipo: Malia T---

392 I mean Maile B--- and Kalii M---.

393 Malia: (Smiles) Yeah (Tosses her marker in the box.)

394 Leilani: Well, if you put it that way

395 Malia: Put it that way

396 Pono: (Sings) Way from me (stops suddenly)

397 Kaipo: Okay, Pono ((Inaudible))

March 18 - TOPIC #18 -Assignment

398 Pono: (Picks up book) Now I have to do this 'kay?

399 Kaipo: Okay

400 Girl: Can I have your eraser Pono?

401 Pono: I put it on your desk (waving the book).

402 (Leilani speaks inaudibly to Malia while pointing at Kaipo. Then both laugh)

403 Pono: Ah, you screwed me up!

404 L & M: (Laugh)

March 18 -TOPIC #19 - Fooling Around

405 Kaipo: Ooh,

406 the two you have been laughing for a long time!

407 Malia: (To Leilani) Ooh, ((Inaudible))

408 Oh what was that?

409 (Leilani bursts out laughing again, Pono begins writing)

410 Kaipo: Oo-o-oh lemme (waving his hand)

411 Leilani: (Laughs, picks up a handful of pens as if to throw them at Kaipo)

412 Malia: (To Leilani) He's just acting normal.

413 Let him do it.

414 (To Kaipo) Here, let me look it over.

415 (Kaipo turns it around and gives it to her.)

416 Leilani: (Grabs Malia's pen as she holds Kaipo's poster, says something inaudible.)

417 All: (Laugh)

418 Pono: (Looks up from his writing & laughs, then starts singing softly under his breath)

419 Leilani: Help me!

420 All: (Laugh)

421 Leilani: I can't breathe.

422 Kaipo: Then die!

423 (All laughter, then Leilani grabs Malia's pen again)

424 Leilani: Malia

425 Malia, I' ll sing a song

426 (Sings) Don' t walk away from me.

427 Don' t walk away from me.

428 All: (Laugh)

429 Pono: Yeah that' s mean boys

430 All: (Laugh)

431 Leilani: Look try go like this.

432 Put your hand like this

433 (Holds her arm winglike).

434 Goes like this

435 try ta bite your ear

436 Kaipo: Try to play ((Inaudible))

437 All: (Laugh)

438 Leilani: Because she's so mental.

439 All: (Laugh)

440 Malia: Don't cry now!

441 Leilani: (Mimicking someone crying as all laugh)

442 Pono: (Tries to write, then makes exaggerated sobs)

443 Kaipo: (To Pono) Don't die.

444 Malia: (To Teacher) That's them (pointing at others)

445 Teacher: (Off screen) If you wouldn't mind.

446 Leilani: Where's my pencil?

447 Oh I threw it in the bag.

448 Kaipo: ((Inaudible))

449 Looks like you're acting like Ali'i for one day.

450 Leilani: What?

451 Kaipo: You always act like Ali'i.

452 Leilani: (Makes a face)

March 18 - TOPIC #20 - Assignment

453 Malia: Just talk about this (Points to poster)

454 Kaipo: Well it's true.

455 Malia: Okay.

456 Pono: I told you ((Inaudible)) because of what?

457 (General classroom noise, group members work quietly)

458 Malia: Do we have to write all the definitions that we found?

459 [Or just the one that

460 Kaipo: [The one that we're using.

461 Malia: ((Inaudible))

462 Kaipo: Think so.

463 Malia: Oo-oh! (Gets up, leaves table)

464 Leilani: Doesn't make sense

March 18 - TOPIC #21 - Activities

465 Kaipo: Bless the angels.

466 The angels were on my side.

467 [It's not

468 Leilani: [Where's my eraser?

469 Where's my eraser dummy?

470 (Laughs)

471 Kaipo: I don't have it.

472 I'm not Alii's roommate anymore.

473 Pono: Why?

474 Kaipo: We move tonight.

475 Pono: Why?

476 Kaipo: Because it's time to move?

477 ((Inaudible))

March 18 - TOPIC #22 - Assignment

478 Leilani: Alright guys listen to this (reads)

479 'The first time I looked at Gabriel,

480 I could hardly contain myself.'

481 Is that a good beginning?

482 Pono: Yeah

483 Uh not quite

484 Got far away to go.

485 (Pono mumbles as he writes, Leilani begins writing, and Kaipo watches other students.)

March 18 - TOPIC #25 - Fooling Around

486 Kaipo: Pono, stick out your tongue at your nose.

487 Pono: (Places his finger on the end of his nose.)

488 Kaipo: No

489 With your tongue touching them.

490 Pono: No (laughs)

491 Leilani: [(Places her finger on the end of her nose, with her tongue sticking out, touching her thumb and laughs.)

492 Kaipo: [No

493 I said

494 Make your TONGUE touch your nose.

495 Pono: (Tries and fails)

496 Leilani: (Pulls her tongue out with her fingers)

497 Kaipo: My cousin could.

498 I can.

499 (Shows)

500 Pono: (Laughs)

501 Leilani: Isn't that your lip?

502 That's your lip,

502 not your tongue.

504 (Laughs)

505 Kaipo: (Keeps trying)

March 18 -TOPIC #24 - Assignment

506 (Leilani and Pono return to their writing)

507 Kaipo: Pono

508 Pono: (Ignores)

509 (Kaipo returns to writing, Malia returns to table)

510 Malia: There was this girl going

511 (Puts her hand to her mouth) going

512 You didn't even notice!

513 (Shrugs, works on poster)

514 Pono: (To someone off screen) Can you put it in single space?

515 Like when it goes like?

516 (Turns around to talk off screen, inaudible)

517 (Leilani & Malia talk inaudibly & laugh, Malia gets up and leaves table)

518 Pono: Oh, okay.

519 (Turns back to his desk)

March 18 - TOPIC #25 - Fooling Around

520 (Malia returns, Kaipo and Leilani look at her and burst out laughing. Malia laughs.)

521 Malia: [You didn't

522 Leilani: [No, never mind.

523 Malia: (Speaks inaudibly & shrugs.)

524 Pono: Oo-ow-w

525 Get away from me (Backs his chair away)

526 Malia: (Shrugs) He bought the shirt (Laughs)

527 Kaipo: You can see right through it?

528 Leilani: G. E. T. E. ((Inaudible))

529 Wake up!

530 Pono (Leaves table.)

531 Leilani: Everybody (Sniff)

532 Malia: You' re mental

533 M&L&K: (Laughter)

534 Kaipo: [Wake up and smell the coffee.

535 Teacher: [(In background) Okay everybody

536 [You have about five minutes left to get

537 Malia: [Wake up and smell the coffee.

538 Leilani: Wake up and smell the

539 What am I saying?

540 Wake up and smell the blueberries.

541 (Points at Malia and laughs)

543 Malia: I don't know tell me what you' re saying.

543 (Laughs)

March 18 - Topic #26 - Activities

544 Kaipo: Leilani can we go please.

545 Leilani: Why?

546 Kaipo: Fine

547 I went with you to Ms. Weeks.

548 Leilani: So?

549 (Laughs)

550 When

551 When do you want me to go?

552 Kaipo: After school

553 Leilani: I can't.

554 Kaipo: After the bookstore.

555 Leilani: I can't.

556 I'm not going to the bookstore.

557 Kaipo: Yes you are.

558 Malia: You have to go tell Miss Smith

559 I thought you were gonna borrow money from her?

560 Leilani: I'm going to the mall,

561 to bum some.

562 (Laughs)

563 All (Write quietly)

564 Kaipo: I'd rather smell this. (Points off screen)

565 Malia: (Looks at something off screen and laughs.)

March 18 - TOPIC #27 - Fooling Around

566 Kaipo: I'm going to turn this off.

(Takes microphone, pulls off the foam microphone cover, places thumb over end.)

567 What's ugly?

568 You or the poster?

569 Leilani: (Looking up and gasping) Kaipo!

570 Kaipo: (Laughing) I was just joking.

571 Leilani: Did you hear what Kaipo said?

572 (Picks up & speaks directly into microphone)

573 Kaipo said

574 (Pulls microphone out of Kaipo's reach)

575 No Kaipo, it's mine.

575 [Kaipo said

576 Kaipo: [(Fumbles with the microphone) It's off.

577 Leilani: Kaipo said,

578 [when Jenny said

579 Kaipo: [No it's not leave it alone.

580 Leilani: When Jenny said, "Oo-oh, it's ugly',

581 Kaipo said

582 you or the poster?

583 (Laughs)

584 Kaipo: (Takes microphone) Leilani said that, not me.

585 Leilani: (Gasps, grabs the microphone)

586 Liar, liar, pants on fire!

587 [(Laughs)

588 Kaipo: [(Laughs, grabs microphone, and places it back in its stand)

589 Kaipo: Wake up and smell the embalming fluid

590 Leilani: [What?

591 Kaipo: [(Laughs)

592 Did you know that cherries are dipped in embalming fluid?

593 Leilani: [(Talks inaudibly)

594	Kaipo:	[I think that
595	Leilani:	Hey! (Brings her hand down on Malia's in the magic marker box)
596	Kaipo:	I'm not sure,
597		[I think they are...
598	Leilani:	[Shut up and listen!
599	Malia:	Hey!
600	Kaipo:	Do you know what embalming fluid is Leilani?
601	Leilani:	I do.
602		I'm just trying to tell you something
603		if you'll just listen!
604	Kaipo:	Okay.
605	Leilani:	See now I forgot what I was gonna to say.
606	Kaipo:	What does embalming fluid mean?
607		I mean what is embalming fluid?
608	Leilani:	I wasn't talking about embalming fluid.
609	Kaipo:	Embalming fluid is the fluid they put in a person.
610		In a dead person's body to freeze up the body.
611	Leilani:	Oh
612		No okay I remember
613		I remember
614		Listen, listen, listen.
615	Ikakia:	They soak cherries
616		I think they soak cherries in it.
617	Leilani:	Can you please listen?
618		(Laughs)

619 Okay

620 Okay listen

621 Kaipo: (Talks into microphone)

622 They always act like that to me.

623 Leilani: Listen

624 Will you listen for a little while.

625 Kaipo: No!

626 Leilani: Huh huh huh?

627 What is "D"?

628 Do you like them?

629 L & M: (Laugh)

630 Kaipo: No

631 (Tosses marker back in the box, reaches for another as Leilani takes the box.)

632 You smell.

633 (Takes a marker.)

634 You smell like this.

635 (Holds marker for her to smell)

636 Leilani: (Fixing her hair) Oo-oh.

637 It's smells like Kaipo's butt.

638 L & M: (Laugh)

639 Kaipo: (Picking up microphone) Not!

640 Leilani's!

641 Malia: It's not th-a-at bad (laughing)

642 Nah-na

643 Kaipo: (Into microphone)

644 Leilani likes to smell ((Inaudible)).

645 Leilani: He doesn't smell.

646 Kaipo: Oh yes he does.

647 Malia: He's not in this school anymore.

648 Leilani: He's not?

649 Really?

650 Malia: He got kicked out.

651 [Mm-m-m Tuesday

652 Kaipo: [No wait

653 No wait the last,

654 the last fight was with Kimo.

655 Kimo got on probation

March 18 - Topic # 28 - Assignment

656 Kaipo: (Gets up and takes his poster off screen)

657 Malia: Oh man.

658 I can't find any pictures of snobby people.

659 Kaipo: (Returns) Don't bother me I have to read.

(To Pono off screen)

660 Pono why are you so back there?

661 Pono: Cuz I don't wanna

662 I don't wanna get busted.

663 Leilani: (Gets up and goes off screen to Pono.)

664 Kaipo: I feel rejected at this table.

665 (Pushes his chair away from the table,

off camera)

666 Leilani: (Near Pono) Come Pono.

667 Pono: All right.

668 [You promise you won't be noisy?

669 Leilani: [Promise sorry

670 Pono: [Okay

671 I forgive you

(Pono & Leilani move back to table with Malia)

672 Leilani: So why is 'Ipo over there now?

673 Here Malia listen to this paragraph.

674 (She puts her head on the desk, not reading)

675 (The teacher comes over, stands next to Malia. An unidentified boy sits in a chair next to Kaipo's place. Mrs. Smith and Malia talk in inaudible voices.)

676 Pono: (Reads) Write a third paragraph about

((Inaudible))

677 Oh, wow.

678 I can do it on the back?

679 (Puts down his notebook and walks off camera.)

680 L & M: ((Talk inaudibly with teacher))

BELL RINGS CLASS ENDS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, P. S., & Pinao, N. (1993). Aloha Spirit: "Are we losing our aloha spirit?" In R.W. Roth (Ed.), *The Price of Paradise* (Vol. II). Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.

Au, K.H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 11, 91-115.

Baker, C.D. (1992). Description and analysis in classroom talk and interaction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 27(2), 9-14.

Barnes, D., & Todd, F. (1977). *Communication and learning in small groups*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barnes, D., & Todd, F. (1994). *Communication and learning revisited: meaning making through talk*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Baxter, L. A., & Goldsmith, D. (1990). Cultural terms for communication events among some American high school adolescents. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 377-394.

Bayer, A. (1990). *Collaborative-apprenticeship learning: Language and thinking across the curriculum, K-12*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Beach, R., Green, J., Kamil, M.K., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (1992), *Multiple disciplinary perspectives on language and literacy research*. Urbana, IL: NCRE & NCTE.

Beach, R., & Hynds, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Developing discourse practices in adolescence and adulthood*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bloome, D. (1989). Beyond Access: An ethnographic study of reading and writing in a seventh grade classroom. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Classrooms and literacy* (pp. 53-104). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bloome, D. (1992). Anthropology and research on teaching the English language arts. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teaching the English language arts* (pp. 46-56). New York: Macmillan.

Bloome, D., & Bailey, F. (1992). Studying language and literacy through events, particularity and intertextuality. In R. Beach, J. Green, M.L. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multiple disciplinary perspectives on language and literacy research* (pp. 181-210). Urbana, IL: NCRE & NCTE.

Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(4), 305-333.

Bloome, D., & Theodorou, E. (1988). Analyzing teacher-student and student-student discourse. In J.L. Green & J.O. Harker (Eds.), *Multiple perspective analyses of classroom discourse* (pp. 217-249). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Boggs, S. (1985). *Speaking, relating, and learning: A study of Hawaiian children at home and at school.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Britton, J. (1970). *Talking and writing.* London: Methuen.

Bruffee, K.A. (1993). *Collaborative Learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bossert, S.T. (1979). *Tasks and social relationships in classrooms.* New York: University of Cambridge Press.

Carbaugh, D. (1988). *Talking American: Cultural discourses on "Donahue."* Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Carbaugh, D. (1989). Fifty terms for talk. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 13, 93-120.

Carbaugh, D. (Ed.). (1990). *Cultural communication and intercultural contact*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom Discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmith, NH: Heinemann.

Cazden, C., John, V., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press/University Press of America.

Chandler, S. (1992). Learning for what purpose? Questions when viewing classroom learning from a sociocultural curriculum perspective. In H.H. Marshall (Ed.), *Redefining Student Learning: Roots of educational change*. Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Collins, E. (1990). *Content as constructed: A study of two contrasting units of instruction in a 4th/5th grade class*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Collins, E., & Green, J. (1994). Learning in classroom settings: Making or breaking a culture. In H.H. Marshall (Ed.), *Redefining Student Learning: Roots of educational change*. Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Cone, J.K. (1993). Using classroom talk to create community and learning. *English Journal*, 10, 30-38.

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Gumperz, J. (1992). Changing views of language in education: The implications for literacy research. In R, Beach, J. Green, M.L. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multiple disciplinary perspectives on language and literacy research* (pp. 151-180). Urbana, IL: NCRE & NCTE.

Cooper, C.R., Marquis, A., & Ayer-Lopez, S. (1982). Peer learning in the classroom: Tracing developmental patterns and consequences of children's spontaneous interactions. In L.C. Wilkinson, (Ed.), *Communicating in the classroom* (pp. 69-84). New York: Academic Press.

D'Amato, J. (1986). *We cool tha's why: A study of personhood and place in a class of Hawaiian second graders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

D'Amato, J. (1993). Resistance and compliance in minority classrooms. In E. Jacob & C. Jordon (Eds.), *Minority education: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 181- 207). Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Delamont, S. (1983). *Interaction in the classroom*, 2nd Ed. London: Methuen.

Dorval, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Conversational organization and its development*. Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Dyson, A.H. (1989). *Multiple worlds of child writers: Friends learning to write*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eckert, P. (1993). Cooperative competition in adolescent "girl talk." In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 32-61). New York: Oxford University Press.

Eder, D. (1993). "Go get ya a French!": Romantic and sexual teasing among adolescent girls. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 17-31). New York: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common Knowledge*. London: Methuen.

Edwards, A.D., & Westgate, D.P. (1987). *Investigating classroom talk*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Egan-Robertson, A., (1994). *Literacy Practices, Personhood, and Students as Researchers in Their Own Communities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Erickson, F. (1981). Timing and context in everyday discourse. In W.P. Dickson (Ed.), *Children's oral communication skills*. New York: Academic Press.

Erickson, F. (1993). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. In E. Jacob & C. Jordon (Eds.), *Minority education: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 27-52). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Erickson, F., & Schultz, J. (1977). When is a context?: Some issues of and methods in the analysis of social competence. *Quarterly Newsletter of the Institute for Comparative Human Development*, 1(2), 5-6.

Everhart, R. (1983). *Reading, writing, and resistance*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fitch, K.L.. (1994). The issues of selection of objects of analysis in ethnographies of speaking. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 27(1), 51-93.

Floriani, A. (1994). Negotiating what counts: Roles and relationships, texts and contexts, content and meaning. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 241-274.

Forman, E., & Cazden, C.B. (1985). Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: the cognitive value of peer interaction. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed.) *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gallimore, R., Boggs, J.W., & Jordon, C. (1974). *Culture, behavior and education: A study of Hawaiian-Americans*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Gallimore, R., & Howard, A. (1968). *Studies in a Hawaiian community: na makamaka o Nanakuli*. Pacific Anthropological Records #1. Honolulu: B.P. Bishop Museum.

Gallimore, R., & Howard, A. (1979). *Nanakuli Project Annotated Bibliography*, Occasional Paper #1.

Gilles, C. (1991). *Negotiating the meanings: The uses of talk in literature study groups by adolescents labeled learning-disabled*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri at Columbia.

Gilles, C. (1993). "We make an idea": Cycles of meaning in literature discussion groups. In K.M. Pierce, C.J. Gilles, & D. Barnes (Eds.), *Cycles of Meaning: Exploring the potential of talk in learning communities* (pp. 199-218). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gilmore, P., & Glatthorn, A. (Eds.). (1982). *Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Goffman, E. (1993). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (Original work published in 1981)

Golden, J. (1987). An exploration of reader-text interaction in a small group discussion. In D. Bloome (Ed.) *Literacy and Schooling* (pp. 169-194). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Goodwin, M. (1978). *Conversational practices in a peer group of urban black children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Goodwin, M. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, M. (1993). Tactical uses of stories: Participation frameworks within boys' and girls' disputes. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 110-143). New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, J.L. (1992). Multiple perspectives: Issues and directions. In R, Beach, J. Green, M.L. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multiple disciplinary perspectives on language and literacy research* (pp. 19-34). Urbana, IL: NCRE & NCTE.

Green, J.L., & Dixon, C.N. (1994). Talking knowledge into being: Discursive and social practices in classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 231-239.

Green, J.L., & Wallat, C. (1981). Mapping instructional conversations: A sociolinguistic ethnography. In J.L. Green and C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 161-205). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heath, S. B. (1986). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, A. (1974). *Ain't no big thing: coping strategies in a Hawaiian-American community*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations is sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. (1981). *In vain I tried to tell you*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jacobs, E., & Jordon, C. (1993). *Minority education: Anthropological perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Jordon, C. (1984). Cultural compatibility and the education of ethnic minority children. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8(4), 59-71.

Jordon, C. (1992). The role of culture in minority school achievement. *Kamehameha Journal of Education*, 3(2), 53-68.

Jordon, C., Au, K., Joesting, A. (1983). Patterns of classroom interaction with pacific islands children: The importance of cultural differences. In M. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *Comparative research in bilingual education: Asian-Pacific American perspectives* (pp. 216-242). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ludlam, D. E. (1992). *A sociolinguistic investigation of social identities in peer instructional writing groups*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Marshall, H.H. (Ed.).(1994). *Redefining Student Learning: Roots of educational change*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

McDermott, R.P. , Godspodinoff, K., & Aron, J. (1978). Criteria for an ethnographically adequate description of concerted activities and their contexts. *Semiotica*, 24, 3-4.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case study research in education: a qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Michaels, S. (1981). "Sharing Time": Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society*, 10:423-422.

Michaels, S., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1979). A study of sharing time with first-grade students: Discourse narratives in the classroom. *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 4:1-4.

Moffet. J.(1983). *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Moll, L. (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of socio-historical psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participation structures and communicative competence: Warm springs children in community and classroom. In C.B. Cazden, V.P. John & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-397). New York: Teachers College Press.

Phillips, T. (1985). Beyond lip-service: Discourse development after the age of nine. In G. Wells & J. Nicholls (Eds.), *Language and learning: An interactional perspective* (pp. 59-82). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Phinney, M.Y. (1992). *Writing, sociality, and identity in kindergarten: An ethnographic study*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Pierce, K.M., Gilles, C.J. & Barnes, D.(Eds.). (1993). *Cycles of meaning: exploring the potential of talk in learning communities*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pinnell, G.S. (1984). Communication in small group settings. *Theory Into Practice*, 23(3), 246-254.

Pinnell, G.S., & Jaggar, A, M. (1992). Oral Language: Speaking and listening in the classroom. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teaching the English language arts* (pp. 691-720). New York: Macmillan.

Pukui, M.K. & Elbert, S.H. (1986). *Hawaiian Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.

Santa Barbara Discourse Group. (1992b). Do you see what I see? The referential and intertextual nature of classroom life. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 27(2), 29-36.

Santa Barbara Discourse Group. (1994). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H.H. Marshall (Ed.), *Redefining Student Learning: Roots of educational change* (pp. 119-154). Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1980). Literacy as focused interaction. *Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 2, 26-29.

Shuman, A. (1986). *Storytelling rights: The uses of oral and written texts by urban adolescents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Solomon, A.L. (1980). *Cross-cultural conflicts between public education and traditional Hawaiian values*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.

Solsken, J.W. (1993). *Literacy, gender, and work in families and in school*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Speidel, G. (1987b). Conversation and learning in the classroom. In K.E. Nelson & A. van Kleeck (Eds.), Child Language *(Vol. 6). Hillsdale, NJ:* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stock, P., & Robinson, J. (1989). Literacy as conversation: Classroom talk as text building. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Classrooms and Literacy* (pp. 311-388). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Stubbs, M., & Hillier, H. (Eds.). (1983). *Readings on language schools and classrooms*. London: Metheun.

Tanada-Matumi, J., & Tharp, R.G. (1977). Teaching the teachers of Hawaiian children: Training and consultation strategies. *Topics in Culture Learning*, 5, 9-106.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: William Morrow and Company. (Original work published in 1986)

Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Todorov, T. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. (W. Godzich, Trans.) Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Trimbar, J. (1992). Consensus and difference in collaborative learning. In P. Shannon (Ed.), *Becoming Political: Readings and writings in the politics of literacy education* (pp. 208-222). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Vogt, L.A., Jordon, C.J., & Tharp, R.G. (1987). Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18, 276-286.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. (E. Haufmann & G. Vakar, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published in 1934)

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman, Eds & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers: Children learning language and using language to learn*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wells. G & Nicholls, J.(Eds.). (1985). *Language and Learning: An interactional perspective*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Wells, G., & Chang-Wells, G.L. (1992). *Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilkinson, C.L. (Ed.). (1982). *Communicating in the classroom*. New York: Academic Press.

Willett, J., Solsken, J., & Wilson Keenan, J. (1994). *Constructing multicultural literacy practices through parent participation: An intertextual analysis*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Reading Conference, San Diego, CA.

Zaharalick, A., & Green J.L. (1992). Ethnographic research. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teaching the English language arts* (pp. 205-225). New York: Macmillan.